DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 290 886 CE 049 550

TITLE	A Prospectus of Working Women's Concerns. Hearings before the Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities of the Committee on Education and Labor. House of Representatives, One Hundredth Congress, First Session (July 21-22, 1987).
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Education and Labor.
PUB DATE	87
NOTE	263p.; Serial No. 100-43.
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090) -- Viewpoints (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC11 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Day Care; *Employed Women; *Equal Opportunities (Jobs); *Federal Legislation; Hearings; Nontraditional Occupations; Poverty; *Salary Wage Differentials; *Sex Discrimination; *Sex Fairness

ABSTRACT

This document contains congressional hearings to raise a variety of issues and problems pertaining to women in the workplace. It focuses on legislation that might alleviate any adverse conditions that might exist, especially H.R. 2577, the Economic Equity Act of 1987. Issues include barriers in pay equity, wider opportunities for women and integrating the male-dominated fields, underemployment, child care, and the femininization of poverty. Testimony includes statements and prepared statements of representatives in Congress and individuals representing the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights; Children's Defense Fund; KRBK-TV, Sacramento; Bureau of National Affairs, Inc.; Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor; American Association of Retired Persons; Brandeis University; Kings County, Brooklyn, New York; National Institute for Women of Color; Wider Opportunities for Women, Inc.; Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities; McClendon News Service; Pension Rights Center; Women and Poverty Project; and United Food and Commercial Workers International Union. (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

CE

A PROSPECTUS OF WORKING WOMEN'S CONCERNS

ED 290886

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDREDTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

HEARINGS HELD IN WASHINGTON, DC, JULY 21 AND 22, 1987

Serial No. 100-43

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

0084933

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

79-107 WASHINGTON : 1987

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California, *Chairman*

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
CHARLES A. HAYES, Illinois
CARL C. PERKINS, Kentucky
THOMAS C. SAWYER, Ohio
STEPHEN J. SOLARZ, New York
ROBERT E. WISE, JR., West Virginia
TIMOTHY J. PENNY, Minnesota
BILL RICHARDSON, New Mexico
TOMMY F. ROBINSON, Arkansas
PETER J. VISCLOSKY, Indiana
CHESTER G. ATKINS, Massachusetts
JAMES JONTZ, Indiana
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
E. THOMAS COLEMAN, Missouri
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
STEVE BARTLETT, Texas
THOMAS J. TAUKE, Iowa
RICHARD K. ARMEY, Texas
HARRIS W. FAWELL, Illinois
PAUL B. HENRY, Michigan
FRED GRANDY, Iowa
CASS BALLENGER, North Carolina

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California, *Chairman*

PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
CHARLES A. HAYES, Illinois
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
CHESTER G. ATKINS, Massachusetts
JAMES JONTZ, Indiana
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
(Ex Officio)
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
PAUL B. HENRY, Michigan
FRED GRANDY, Iowa
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
(Ex Officio)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CONTENTS

Page

Hearings held in Washington, DC:
July 21, 1987 1
July 22, 1987 129
Statement of:
Berry, Mary Frances, Commissioner, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights 69
Blank, Helen, Director of Child Care, Children's Defense Fund 205
Craft, Christine, news director and co-anchor, KRBK-TV, Sacramento, CA 35
Crim, Sarah K., staff, special projects division, the Bureau of National Affairs, Inc.; accompanied by: Patricia Logan, staff editor, occupational safety and health reporter 80
Dennis, Shirley M., director of the Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor 14
Engelter, George, member, national legislative committee, American Association of Retired Persons 221
Handler, Dr. Evelyn, president, Brandeis University, Waltham, MA 150
Holtzman, Elizabeth, district attorney, Kings County, Brooklyn, NY 169
Lee, Irene, on behalf of the National Institute for Women of Color 180
Marano, Cynthia, executive director, Wider Opportunities for Women, Inc 101
Martinez, Hon. Matthew, chairman, Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities 1
McClendon, Sarah, director and Washington correspondent, McClendon News Service 42
Moss, Anne, director, women's pension project, Pension Rights Center 246
Oakar, Hon. Mary Ross, a Representative in Congress from the State of Ohio 55
Pearce, Diana, director, Women and Poverty Project 230
Schroeder, Hon. Patricia, a Representative in Congress from the State of Colorado 2
Snowe, Hon. Olympia, a Representative in Congress from the State of Maine 130
Wynn, William H., international president, United Food and Commercial Workers International Union; accompanied by: Pat Scarcelli, vice president and director of women's affairs 90
Prepared statements:
Berry, Mary Frances, Commissioner, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights 74
Blank, Helen, director, Child Care, Children's Defense Fund, Washington, DC 209
Craft, Christine, news director and co-anchor, KRBK-TV, Sacramento, CA 38
Crim, Sarah, staff editor, the Bureau of National Affairs, Inc 83
Dennis, Shirley M., director of the Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor 18
Engelter, George, AARP board of directors, American Association of Retired Persons 224
Gunderson, Hon. Steve, a Representative in Congress from the State of Wisconsin 143
Handler, Evelyn E., president, Brandeis University, Waltham, MA 154
Holtzman, Elizabeth, district attorney of Kings County, NY 173
Lee, Irene, on behalf of National Institute for Women of Color 183
Marano, Cynthia, executive director, Wider Opportunities for Women, Inc 105
McClendon, Sarah, McClendon News Service 47
Moss, Anne, director, women's pension project, Pension Rights Center 248

Prepared statements—Continued Page
Oakar, Hon. Mary Rose, a Representative in Congress from the State of Ohio 60
Pearce, Diana M., director, Women and Poverty Project 236
Schroeder, Hon. Patricia, a Representative in Congress from the State of Colorado 5
Snowe, Hon. Olympia, a Representative in Congress from the State of Maine 134
Wynn, William H., international president, United Food and Commercial Workers International Union 93
Letters:
Smail, Annette Klang, Novato, CA, letter to Congresswoman Barbara Boxer, dated July 20, 1987 to be inserted in Congressional Record 258

A PROSPECTUS OF WORKING WOMEN'S CONCERNS

TUESDAY, JULY 21, 1987

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:30 a.m., in room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Matthew G. Martinez (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Members present: Representatives Martinez, Williams, Hayes, Owens, Jontz, Hawkins, and Gunderson.

Staff present: Eric Jensen, Valerie White, Tammy Harris, Shirley Wilcher, Mark Poroden, Jeff Fox, and Mary Gardner.

STATEMENT OF HON. MATTHEW MARTINEZ, CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

Mr. MARTINEZ. As somebody said this morning, I would be late to my own funeral. I don't know if that is necessarily true, but at least let me apologize to my colleague, Pat Schroeder.

We are going to be joined in a few minutes by Congressman Hayes. So I will just go ahead and start the hearing, and get my morning and get my statement out of the way.

Let me welcome you all today to this hearing, the first of a two-day hearing. The Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities, which I am the chairman of, has called this hearing to raise a variety of issues and problems pertaining to women in the workplace.

We are here to discuss legislation which might alleviate any adverse conditions that might exist.

There is one bill that we will focus on throughout the hearing, H.R. 2577, I believe appropriately called the Economic Equity Act of 1987. This bill is an omnibus bill that combines about 13 other bills and was introduced last month by our first witness today, the Honorable Pat Schroeder, possible candidate for the presidency, and our colleague the Honorable Olympia Snowe, who will be our first witness at tomorrow's hearing.

There will be three panels each day. The first panel today will discuss women in the work force, the broad perspective; the second will discuss barriers in pay equity; and the last will discuss wider opportunities for women and integrating the male dominated fields of endeavor.

Before beginning, let me share with you a few of my own thoughts.

I believe today that we must recognize that women are key players in the labor market and are key players in our destiny. We should realize that there are less and less women staying at home being wives and mothers and that there are less and less rocking chair grandmothers.

The work force is changing, and more women are becoming a part of it. It is only right that we change our traditional thinking where it hasn't been changed already and make the workplace a more equitable place for women to work. The sooner we do this, the sooner we all reap the benefit of it.

The promises of the Constitution which say equality for all will not be completely realized until all discriminatory practices, especially for gender, as well as race, creed and color, are eliminated from the workplace. Women should have the same opportunities and same benefits as everyone else.

With that, I would like to turn to our first witness, the Honorable Pat Schroeder.

STATEMENT OF HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF COLORADO

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Thank you, very much, Mr. Chairman. I really am delighted that you are doing these hearings.

As the Co-Chair of the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues, we couldn't be more pleased that you are putting this front and center. And we thank you for your long, strong stand on all of these. I think it shows that you have incredible foresight in your willingness to focus on a lot of the problems and concerns facing today's working women.

You are right, in this year we introduced the Economic Equity Act, and this is the third time that we have done that. This bill this year is made up of 17 different pieces of legislation. For the past six years that we have done this, what we have tried to do is find and show that the Equal Rights Amendment really is an economic issue and not a lifestyle issue. These are all pieces of legislation that you really wouldn't have to deal with if you had had equal rights for women.

The Equity Act has encouraged greater awareness, I think, of the continuing inequities women face in the arenas of pensions, social security, business credit, pay, health care, and this one is especially focusing on the issues of work and family because they have become so critical.

Unfortunately, our country keeps pretending like it is 1890 and not 1990. So I am glad you have figured out what century it is and are trying to deal with the real world. But the revolutionary demographic changes have meant that if the average American family wants to play with the American dream of home, car, college, both have to work outside the home. So both are getting two full time jobs. That is very difficult and stressful to deal with.

So a very interesting thing has happened. Women's issues have become working family issues. If you look at what the NOW agenda was in the late sixties, it has now become the mainstream agenda of almost every group out there concerned about the family.

This is economics. Women work for economic reasons. They don't work because they are tired of bon-bons and watching soap operas. They work because they need the money. They are the breadwinners also. No longer are breadwinners gender defined.

So what we do this time is, we look at many of the institutions and the policies that govern the workplace that have not been changed to meet this demographic revolution. The caucus has been working on flexitime bills, on job sharing, on pension reform, equal business credit for women so that they can start their own businesses when they want to, and it deals with the dual responsibilities that women face.

Almost two-thirds of the new entrants into the work force between now and the year 2000 are predicted to be women. So the next generation also is going to be involved in this very precarious balancing act between career, family and marriage.

I have been around this country a lot in the last month, and I am just amazed about how we are talking about why in the world do we still not have comparable or equal pay, why don't we have job guaranteed leaves from work for pregnancy or for child rearing, why don't we have day care? Everybody understands this is a necessity except for the government. There are no part time or flexitime options that are really very real for people because so often what happens if you work part time or flexible time, you lose all your benefits. We have so many people now working without any medical coverage, and a lot of them are women with children, that needs to be addressed to.

So our Equity Act talks about pay equity one more time. We keep passing it in the House, and it goes into that dark hole known as the Senate. Let's hope this time we can get it out of there. We have in there improved working conditions for part time workers, and basically that means offering them health care insurance. You offer them the same percentage of health care insurance, only you can pro rata it in accordance with what you offer the full time, but you don't shut them out. We deal with pension and social security reform, and improved access and quality of dependent care for the children.

The caucus has also been interested in the Family and Medical Leave Act because that is another part that deals with all the different struggles that families have. It is unbelievable that if you get ill, you can be fired for being ill in America. This would give you six months to reclaim your health and your job.

It is incredible when you look at the fact that every single family issue, America is in the worst shape compared to other industrialized nations. Whether you look at divorce rates, adolescent pregnancy, anything that you want to talk about, we are in terrible shape.

The family is our foundation. We know that getting families off to a good start is terribly important, that bonding in the early days of life is terribly important. Yet, you can lose your job for having a baby and not allowing the bonding to take place.

So all these things are really crazy. When you look at other industrialized nations, they dealt with them a long time ago and can't believe that we are just catching up.

So I thank you for having these hearings, and I guess the bottom line, the two things that I think tell you the most about how women feel is, they feel they are paying equal taxes, and so therefore they ought to get equal treatment by this Government. Now, if the Government wants to come and give us a 50 percent cut because they are not going to give us equal treatment on our taxes, then we might talk. But they never make that offer. They want us to pay equal taxes and accept unequal treatment. Women are saying no more. We ought to be entitled to the same kind of protection that everybody else is.

I think the other statistic that tells me how important these hearings are, Congressman Martinez, they are so important because now in America a young woman in school is five times more likely to end up being the sole support of her family than a young man. Now that is the world turned upside down. And I think that does say she needs equal education opportunities, credit opportunities, pay opportunities, and the whole bit. Because it is really not just her well being, it is her family's well being and children's well being.

So the Economic Equity Act and the Family and Medical Leave Act are very important family issues and women's issues. I hope we catch up with the rest of the industrialized world in this historic 100th Congress. Even though it appears we are never going to get women in the Constitution in its 200th anniversary, maybe we can do something about working families in the 100th Congress this year. I thank you for holding the hearings.

[Prepared statement of Hon. Pat Schroeder follows:]

Prepared Statement of Hon. Patricia Schroeder, a Representative in Congress From the State of Colorado

As the Co-Chair of the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues, I am pleased to be here today to open these Oversight Hearings. I look forward to reviewing the information and discussions generated by this very distinguished list of witnesses who, over the next two days, will be addressing a broad range of issues affecting women today. I would like to thank Rep. Martinez for holding these hearings, and for having the foresight to highlight the concerns and problems facing today's working women. I am especially grateful that the Subcommittee will be taking a look at the 1987 Economic Equity Act sponsored by The Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues.

The Equity Act is an omnibus bill comprised of seventeen pieces of legislation that together seek to bring greater equality to the lives of American women. For the past six years, the Equity Act has succeeded in articulating a women's legislative agenda. Most importantly, The Equity Act has encouraged a greater awareness of the continuing inequities women face in the area of pensions, social security, business credit, pay, and health care.

This year's Equity Act builds on our past efforts by introducing legislation that will make a critical difference in women's lives. But this year's Equity Act differs from those in the past in one important respect: this year the issues of work and family define the shape of the bill.

There are two primary factors that contribute to the Equity Act's new direction: first, the revolutionary demographic changes that have transformed the shape and character of the labor force; and second, the outdated employment policies that do not meet the needs of today's diverse work force where women make up almost half of all workers, and the increasing majority of these women are mothers.

What the 1987 Economic Equity Act recognizes is that in today's world working women's issues are the same as working family issues.

America has become a society in which everyone is expected to work -- including women with young children. In the 1960s and 70s a paid job became an important symbol of self-worth and personal independence. In the 1980s, work continues to be the way most adults identify themselves; for most of us, work is the central organizing principle of our lives. But the truth is that most women work for economic reasons. Millions of families depend on women's earnings.

Unfortunately, many of society's institutions and policies are out of sync with today's reality and were designed during an era when it was thought that men were the breadwinners and women the homemakers.

The Economic Equity Act seeks to resolve this conflict by giving voice to a much needed thoroughgoing reform of the institutions and policies that govern the workplace. The Caucus has long worked toward such achieving policies such as flexitime, job sharing, pension reform, and equal business credit, but now it does so with the added knowledge and goal of finding new solutions to the ever widening gap between home and family responsibilities.

The Equity Act reflects the dual responsibilities women face in today's world, and offers new policies that accommodate the combination of work and family life, not only for women but for the whole family as well. Almost two-thirds of the new entrants into the work force between now and the year 2000 will be women, and 61 percent of all women of working age are expected to have jobs by the year 2000. The balance between work and family will remain a precarious balancing act that needs our attention now before the problems erupt into a full fledged crises.

I have been around the country a lot in the last month, and the demands for comparable pay, job guaranteed leaves from work for pregnancy and child rearing, as well as adequate, affordable day care, and part-time and flexitime options are the same from New Hampshire to California. The Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues through the Economic Equity Act has given these very real concerns a platform: the Equity Act includes legislation advocating pay equity, improved working conditions for part-time workers, pension and social security reform, and improved access and quality of dependent care for children and the elderly.

The Caucus has also been sensitive to a special concern of mine: The Family and Medical Leave Act. This bill builds an important bridge between work and family by enabling a family to carry on its important care giving responsibilities without risking losing their jobs to do so. The bill calls for employers to grant employees up to 18 weeks of unpaid job-protected family leave in

a two year period to care for a sick child or parent, or to care for a newborn or newly adopted child. The bill also extends a job protected leave to workers who become seriously ill and cannot work, including women recuperating from childbirth.

Today you will hear from some that government isn't necessarily the best vehicle for changing old, out-dated employment practices. I don't agree. It's time for the Government to have a positive role in helping families do what they do best: provide care for their children and parents. The continued health of today's family depends on forward looking employment policies. Congress has a critical role to play in closing the gap between the needs of a new diverse work force and antiquated employment practices that disadvantage women and jeopardize the health of their families.

The Economic Equity Act, like the Family and Medical Leave Act, is as much a family issue as a woman's issue. I hope you will keep this in mind as you explore the special concerns of working women. Only then, will we be able to achieve real equity in the work force.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Pat.

Let me start off by touching on something you just said about catching up. You know, I grew up thinking, and I still believe, that America is the greatest country in the world. But there was a little naivety in my thinking that I believed that we do everything better than anybody else.

But like you, in recently traveling around the country and traveling abroad to some other countries. I see things that they are doing that are so much more equitable, especially in regard to their working people.

Japan has an interesting plan where people at whatever job they enter are entering into it almost as a career with that company. And that company is going to make sure that they provide those medical benefits and those maternity benefits and everything else that we are still arguing about.

So sometimes I get a little discouraged that we are really not as great as sometimes we like to believe we are, and we are really not as advanced as we sometimes like to believe we are. Rather than just thinking it, we ought to practice it.

Let me touch on one thing which I have heard a lot of lately. In fact, I have had special interest groups lobby me about it. That is, parental leave, where we try to do something to provide a more conducive family unit where the father as well as the mother gets to understand and realize responsibility to the newborn child.

It seems to be that the big uproar is that all of a sudden we will bankrupt all these companies, and especially the small companies. Would you respond to that a little bit?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I would be more than happy to. You know, when we have pediatricians telling us they can't tell which kids will get in trouble, but they can tell which ones won't, we ought to listen. And when they tell us how very important that early bonding is, we ought to listen; that a baby and its parents don't bond in the delivery room saying, hi, mom, hi, dad, you can go back to work now, glad to be here, see you for dinner. It doesn't work that way.

The bonding is very essential, and you are laying a foundation for an entire future of this family and this child and everyone else. Yet, in this country, except in California and a few other progressive states like yours, people can be fired for staying home with their children. The only criteria we have is if the woman can get up and walk and her health is all right, then she is to come back to work. Nothing about the emotional health or the bonding or any of that is taken into account.

At the same time, we don't provide day care for infants anywhere. And I don't think infant day care is really very good even if you do provide it. It is very costly and so forth.

But what you were doing is, at a time when it is so important to try and support a family and get a good foundation going, we are absolutely tearing them apart emotionally by forcing them to leave the baby before they are ready, by causing the woman or the man to be angry that they have to do that, maybe blame their other partner because of the economic situation being such that they have to do that and so forth. So you are just adding more stress and tension at a very fragile time.

I think all of us when we had children realized that is a very, very emotional time when all sorts of things are in flux and changing.

If you cannot have the time to at least get that sorted out and the bonding goes on and everybody is firmly based, we are going to pay very dearly for that in this country.

Every other industrialized country except South Africa and the United States did this in the thirties and forties. Thank goodness, your state did it, and the Supreme Court upheld it. But a lot of other states haven't, and that is one of the things I think we should certainly move on.

We throw more rhetoric at families out of this city than I have ever seen. That is all we do for them. We throw rhetoric at them.

Mr. MARTINEZ. One of the things that we have been talking about ever since I got here some five years ago is day care.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Absolutely.

Mr. MARTINEZ. And the need to provide day care for mothers, single mothers especially, who are trying to get off welfare. We are still arguing that in the bill we are trying to pass out of the full committee, on welfare reform.

Here again, it always goes back to the cost, what it is going to cost. You touched on it. It is going to cost us more in the long run than it is if we take care of it now and provide these opportunities now.

But let's go back to the other parental leave. Still, what is the counter argument to this big worry that it is going to bankrupt companies?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Well, on day care, first of all, the Federal Government for all its talk is contributing half as much on day care as it was in 1981. There are many more people who need day care help.

Companies that say that they are going to be bankrupt by providing day care, I just don't understand at all. I think you will find that many who have done it have found that it is a fringe benefit that has really paid off phenomenally because people then stay there and they don't move around to other companies as much, and they don't lose what they had in training and everything else. So, they found it to be a very good investment.

I think one of the challenges we have to do is show companies there are a lot of ways to do day care. Normally when you talk to a company about it, they think, oh, my goodness, I am going to have to build something, it's insurance, it's all this expense, and on and on and on. There are all sorts of other creative ways to do day care that is not quite that costly that innovative employers have found.

I think we are going to have to spend a lot of time pointing that out, because that is what happens. I think they just panic and thing, oh, it's insurance, it's regulations, it's building, it's money, and please don't do that to us.

Mr. MARTINEZ. What about the other philosophy that I have heard expressed that, most people if they really wanted to, get to work, and they point to so many people that do do it. I have in my own family a great example of their philosophy that family members should provide day care if these people need to get out and work and if these people really wanted to get out and work. I have

five married children. They and their spouses are both working, and they all have children. Fortunately they have someone in the family to be able to care for the children.

But I know so many women who don't have that situation. This is a very prevalent situation where they don't have some family member. So they have to depend on somebody outside the immediate family for that day care.

How do we convince these people that not every situation is the perfect family situation they envision in their minds?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I think that is the hardest part. We keep viewing the American family as the Norman Rockwell painting, you know, absolute perfection. That's not what it looks like. So we have to legislate on reality and not nostalgia, and point out to people that this is a very transient country. People move. Lots of people don't even have a family member anywhere within a thousand mile radius of their home.

So to come up with those kinds of solutions, they are really not solutions for a lot of people who also need jobs. So you need to provide a menu, and a lot of different things that can be selected from.

One of the things we keep focusing on is allowing day care to be deductible under your income tax. For heaven's sakes, it's a cost of doing business. We will allow people to deduct three martini lunches, but not day care. What kind of standard is that?

So that is a lot of what we are trying to focus on in the caucus is showing that, while we say we are child oriented, we aren't at all. You do a whole lot better off in our economy if you raise thoroughbred dogs or horses. You can write off everything. If you have children, no. You are out there, and everybody gives 14 reasons for why your problems aren't their problems.

I don't think that is really very good for this country. It has been a lot of what has led us to where we are.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Pat.

Mr. Williams.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just want to commend our friend Pat Schroeder for her leadership on what is perhaps the coming major American issue; that is, an issue that surrounds a fairly recent phenomenon, the evolution of the American work force.

It has been a silent, almost unnoticed evolution. The gentlelady from Colorado is the congressional leader in trying to bring to the attention of the Congress and the American people the fact that this evolution requires different public responses at both the Federal, State, local and private level, than have heretofore been made.

Those responses will include eventually in this country changes in leave policies, in wages, day care policies, the American tax structure, American pension policies, worker safety issues, and I am sure other things that we haven't yet thought about.

Those changes are coming in America. America will achieve those changes, hopefully sooner rather than later. If the gentlelady from Colorado has her way, it will be sooner. And I join her in those efforts and thank her for being here today.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Thank you very much. I think you were the one that said this should be our moon shot legislation. I think you are

right. I think it is trying to bring us up to where we are supposed to be.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Mr. Williams.

Mr. Gunderson?

Mr. GUNDERSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Pat, for your testimony. I just quickly reviewed it here. I would like to look at this from a different perspective. When we discuss women's issues and women in the employment force, we tend to deal with them from a rather broad macro perspective.

I happen to come from rural America where we have a major transition occurring economically, and where I would say that we have an even greater transition occurring with women in the work force.

Can you, both for the record and from my perspective, try to translate how the Economic Equity Act would impact upon rural America and rural women in particular?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Absolutely. In our very first Economic Equity Act that we put out, we did a lot to recognize how far behind the laws were for rural women. At that point what was happening was under the Federal inheritance laws, if a man predeceased the woman and they were on a ma and pa farm, ma usually had to sell the farm to pay the taxes, which was crazy. We treated it as though it was a windfall to her, that one more time, she had just been sitting around watching soap operas while he worked, and this is a windfall.

I mean, that is absolutely phony. Anyone who understands rural America knows that both the man and the woman have worked very hard. So we got the inheritance laws changed. That was one of our great successes. We did that in our first Economic Equity Act.

Now what we have got, it is even harder for the man and the wife to make money on the farm. So very often the wife also has another job. She is in a unique position where she almost has three full time jobs, a mother and wife, and a farmer's wife which means that you are really one of the hired hands too—everybody is out doing whatever you have to do—and often has another job in town.

So the pension discrimination, social security discrimination, all of those things impact on her as they do other women in the workplace. So she falls under that general category.

But the first thing we hit was the inheritance, and I think that that one, I am very proud to say, we were successful in getting done.

Mr. GUNDERSON. One of the things you might want to take with you to Iowa and check out as you are traveling around is the question of how you deal with displacement of farmers, and particularly farm women. In any accounting of employment statistics, if you are lucky, the male displaced farmer will be counted in unemployment statistics. I think I can almost guarantee you that in Iowa or anyplace else, the female spouse is never counted in terms of being displaced or being unemployed as a result of that farm going out of business.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. And should be.

Mr. GUNDERSON. This problem of undercounting directly and very significantly affects the ability to bring job training funds into

rural America. It is one of the things that we have been trying to work on in this Committee.

Another important area that I and my women's advisory group back home have been wrestling with since 1980 unsuccessfully is, how do we provide day care in rural America in a setting that is both of high quality and financially affordable to give rural women any chance of making that transition from homemaker to professional. Any thoughts on that?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Well, it is very difficult. I suppose the best thing that you can possibly do, if the person is working in a town—I mean, if she is working at home, then you have a real problem. I mean, if it is more a cottage industry type of thing, because it becomes very costly if you have somebody transported to the house. But if she is working in a town, you do have churches and schools.

One of our programs has been to see how we can utilize already publicly certified, in place facilities for community day care. Whether employers contribute or how you do it with a sliding scale, depending on how much income you are making, or what, that is one way we can use the facilities that are there in rural America in the towns where the jobs are, rather than building more. I mean, you are not going to be able to build more.

Mr. GUNDERSON. I agree with that, and I agree with what you suggested regarding the use of the schools, churches and other existing facilities. However, while it is nice in theory, the reality is that in rural America there are not even the resources to keep that as a viable option.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. One of the things that we did at the Federal Government the last time with help from people on this committee was a latchkey day care bill which gave communities a small grant to try and do their public facilities, to use that. Then once they had them cranked up, it was a pay as you go type of thing. Anybody who had income at a certain level had to pay at a certain level, and then if they didn't there was some kind of a subsidy. But it was very de minimis. It was Congressman Sala Burton.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Did latchkey pass the Senate?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. We finally got funding for it, yes. Sala Burton got about $10 million worth of funding. It was very de minimis, but we got a toe in the door. I think that is a very important beginning and something we can start to build on because it was a good model.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Thank you.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Mr. Gunderson.

Just allow me to take a minute to respond to that. California has latchkey pretty well going now. In my own community it has worked through the Board of Education. The Board of Education are doing a great job with this. This is really making a big difference.

I went to a recent latchkey installation of officers. They have their little group, and they raise funds. Actually, it wasn't the installation, it was a fundraiser for it, to get additional funds to supplement what they are getting from the Government. I think it was funded in California for several million dollars, and it was sufficient that it has done a great job. It was just seed money really, because now community groups are coming forward.

That's what happens a lot of times when you have a good program, because everybody recognizes the value of a program like that. Last week when we were debating the welfare reform bill here in the full committee, there were people that were ridiculing the idea of 14 year olds going to a day care center. You know, that is very short-sighted thinking. The fact is, they won't be going to day care centers, but they will be going to the equivalent of. And even more than that, they are going to more than the equivalent of because they are actually in these programs getting tutoring, whether it is in athletics that they want to try out for or programs for furthering their education in school. The teachers are volunteering their time because this is such a vital program in the community.

I can't say enough for it. It really has been tremendous as I have seen it in my communities. I think that that piece of legislation was a brainstorm. I don't see why it can't be done on a more national scale. It is simply because so many people aren't aware of the program. I am still surprised how many members of this committee that were not aware of that latchkey program.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. It is very good.

Mr. MARTINEZ. I would like to turn to our chairman. Good morning, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Hawkins, would you like to ask any questions?

Mr. HAWKINS. I look forward to the hearings. I don't want to take up any time, Mr. Chairman. I wish to commend you on taking the leadership. As I look at the list of witnesses you have scheduled, you certainly have done an excellent job, I think, in selecting individuals that I think can contribute very much to this subject.

The subject matter obviously is a very vital part of the work of the full committee, and we certainly appreciate the efforts that you are putting forth in connection with it.

We congratulate our distinguished colleague, Congresswoman Schroeder, for being the lead off witness, and we commend her. Certainly it will be a tough job for this committee to keep up with various ideas and initiatives that she has planned.

Thank you very much.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You have been very patient with us.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Hayes.

Mr. HAYES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I too, like my chairman, don't care to usurp any time unnecessarily. I know that my colleague, Mrs. Schroeder, is quite capable of dealing with the subject at hand today, a prospectus of working women and their concerns. Her track record makes her imminently qualified.

I just wanted to say, I am a little bit groggy. Yesterday I was on a whirlwind tour in the State of Connecticut, in Bridgeport, to help add to the numbers, at least by one, of women here in the Congress.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. There is room for you in Heaven, sir.

Mr. HAYES. We tried to get ourselves in a position where at least we can increase the black representation of women by 100 percent.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. That's great.

Mr. HAYES. She has a good chance if we can come through. Today is the day.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Well, we will keep our fingers crossed.

Mr. HAYES. All right.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Thank you, Mr. Hayes.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Mr. Hayes.

Just because he said that, I am going to ask the first question I was supposed to ask, and then I had a second thought about it. I was supposed to ask you what your platform would be if you were elected to the presidency. I had changed the word "if"—what do you mean, if—to "when" she is. But I know that that would take considerable time. So we all, I think, that have worked with you here in Congress know what your platform would be, and it wouldn't be a single issue. It would be a multiple issue.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Absolutely.

Mr. MARTINEZ. So if you should decide, God's speed. Thank you.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Thank you very much.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Let me introduce our first panel then. It consists of Ms. Shirley Dennis, Director, Women's Bureau, Department of Labor; Ms. Christine Craft, News Director and Co-Anchor of KRBK-TV, Sacramento, California. I spent some time in that town, a very short time. I am noted to have a record of some kind in that I served the shortest time in the State legislature of anyone who went on to be elected to a higher office. One newspaper put it, here's a guy that is trying to go from a small town mayor to Congress in less than two years. And I pointed out to them, there are people that have come to Congress that have never served in any political office. At least I had eight years of local service too. But at any rate, I enjoyed Sacramento while I was there. So welcome. My staff director, that's her home town, Sacramento, California. She spent about 16 years working in the State legislature there.

Let me also introduce Ms. Sarah McClendon, Director and Washington Correspondent, McClendon News Service.

We may be joined a little later by Congresswoman Mary Rose Oakar, who is very interested in these issues also. But let us start with Ms. Dennis.

STATEMENT OF SHIRLEY M. DENNIS, DIRECTOR OF THE WOMEN'S BUREAU, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Ms. DENNIS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to, first of all, thank you and the subcommittee for inviting me to discuss women in the labor force. We think that the subcommittee seeks a good perspective on the concerns of working women. You are to be congratulated for this effort, for the role of women is pivotal in the work force today.

I am very pleased to have the opportunity to present an overview of the status of women in our economy and, in essence, in our society overall.

As more women enter the labor force, it is important to view their contributions in the context of the global marketplace as well as the U.S. economy and our work force. This context also includes the urgent need to prepare for the jobs of the future. In particular,

I will discuss work and family issues, preparation for employment by women on welfare and, briefly, the Women's Bureau initiatives.

As members of the subcommittee already know, Secretary of Labor William E. Brock has made the Work Force 2000 Project the cornerstone of his stewardship in the U.S. Department of Labor. The Women's Bureau is proud to play an important role in the Work Force 2000 initiative.

This morning, I will bring news of a recent study by the Hudson Institute on Work Force 2000, commissioned by the Labor Department. The study discusses the changes in the work force that we can expect and the adjustments which will have to be made in our employment and training systems if our workers are to be well matched with tomorrow's employment demands.

Today, women are key players in our economy, as you said earlier, Mr. Chairman. The realization of their importance, however, has been gradual and uneven throughout society as more women have entered the labor force and have claimed long-term attachments to employment.

The same is true globally. As I travel internationally, I am impressed by the increasing recognition of women's key economic role. Awareness of the vital need for women workers in a healthy economy is heightening both among our principal trading partners and within other countries.

Today, in the United States, more than 52 million women age 16 and over are in the labor force, and only about 3.7 million of these women are among the unemployed. These millions of working women are now the majority of all women and comprise 44 percent of the entire labor force. By the year 2000, they are projected to comprise about 47 percent of the labor force.

But the keys to their importance are twofold. One, the economy in the United States has long been and, according to best estimates, will continue to be dominated by the services-producing sector where women are the majority of workers. And, two, women will be the major source of new entrants into the labor market in the foreseeable future, as just indicated by Congresswoman Schroeder.

These two factors, together with the move of our economy toward increased international trade and competition, will have a significant implication for the future of our nation.

Already in the United States we see significant changes taking place. Of the nearly 49 million employed women, the vast majority are working full time. Over half of all wives and half of all mothers are in the labor force. The dual earner family has become the predominant family type in the United States today. Single parent families are growing, the numbers of families maintained by wage earning women increased 25 percent between 1979 and 1986.

The impact of women as both workers and family members is significant.

Women have made great strides in obtaining better paying jobs as they have met, challenged, and conquered many employment barriers. Today, in fact, we have reduced the earnings gap, and women now earn 65 cents for every dollar earned by men.

Yet, with all we have achieved, the largest number of women still are employed in the traditional female occupations, including teachers, clerical workers, nurses, and service workers.

Minority women have also made strides in the labor force. While their numbers do not match the totals for all women job to job, there has been progress. At the same time, however, their high unemployment rates, particularly among young black women, have significant implications for the future labor force.

This brief overview, together with the more detailed analysis included in my full testimony, provide an important background for the research and planning which are at the root of Secretary Brock's Work Force 2000 Project.

Two major reports have been shared recently with the members of this subcommittee. On, the Bureau of Labor Statistics preview of the economy of the year 2000, and, two, Work Force 2000, Work and Workers for the 21st Century, which was issued by the Hudson Institute.

Taken together, the two reports provide solid projections for the coming 13 years.

In addition to the rapid growth of jobs in the service industries, many new jobs will require much higher education and skill levels than the jobs of today.

The work force will also grow more slowly as the pool of young workers entering the labor market shrinks because of slower population growth. Women, minorities and immigrants will become a larger share of the new entrants as in the past.

The Hudson Institute report sets forth a number of major challenges to policy makers that stem from these expected trends of the future. One is the close relationship between the growth of the U.S. economy and the economies of other nations, thus spurring the United States to focus beyond its own share of the world trade and to stimulate balanced world growth.

Developing innovative strategies to reconcile the conflicting needs of women, work and families is another challenge identified by the Hudson Institute report, as is the need to integrate black and Hispanic workers into the economy.

In a nutshell, these trends and projections shape a powerful challenge for the future. We have no choice but to change. If we do not invest more wisely in human development, including minorities, women and immigrants, the loss to this Nation will be irreparable. The shifts in demographics and the new employment opportunities offer a real challenge for good jobs, but only if we are prepared.

In light of these trends and challenges, the Women's Bureau is focusing on three major program areas: one, balancing work and family; two, work-related components of welfare reform; and, three, addressing grassroots concerns of women workers throughout the country.

In the realm of balancing work and family, we have already found that forward-looking employers are beginning to recognize that employees' personal and professional responsibilities affect the workplace, productivity, the family, and society overall.

Flexibility in hours and work and leave patterns, assistance with child care and elder care, flexible benefit packages and prorated benefits for part time employees are all constructive approaches

which we will continue to bring to the attention of employers, employees, unions and others.

The Women's Bureau is now developing a clearinghouse to serve as a national vocal point for the state of the art information on trends and developments in the work and family area. It will be a resource for policy officials, legislators, employees, unions, researchers and others. Final design of the clearinghouse information base and the start of data collection and entry are scheduled for the fall of this year.

I would like to shift now to another important area: our special concern for women on welfare. Recently the Women's Bureau entered the national dialogue on welfare reform. We are encouraging commissions on women and other groups to follow suit. Ninety percent of persons on welfare are women and children. Most of the women are potential members of the work force, if not already working part time.

The more closely welfare programs become tied to preparation for employment, the more the Women's Bureau needs to contribute to policy formulation. We are advocating a holistic approach to help meet individual needs and at the same time strengthen families.

Finally, as we approach the challenges of a new century, the Women's Bureau mandate given to us by Congress in 1920 is more relevant than ever. Promoting the welfare of working women, improving their working conditions, increasing their efficiency and advancing their opportunities for profitable employment are essential when viewed in the context of the year 2000 projections.

The future will mean new opportunities for those who are prepared. The national and grassroots initiatives we undertake are designed to make a difference for those whose lives we touch.

Our impact is measured in human terms which cannot be easily quantified. Serving as chief Federal advocate for the 52 million women already in the work force, and the millions more to come, the Women's Bureau is helping to lay the groundwork so that we can all be prepared for the year 2000 and beyond.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Ms. Dennis.

[Prepared statement of Shirley M. Dennis follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SHIRLEY M. DENNIS, DIRECTOR OF THE WOMEN'S BUREAU, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

I want to thank you and the Members of the Subcommittee for inviting me to discuss women in the labor force as the Subcommittee seeks a perspective on the concerns of working women. You are to be congratulated for this effort for the role of women is pivotal in the workplace today. I am very pleased to have the opportunity to present a overview of the status of women in our economy and, in essence, in our society overall.

As more and more women enter the labor market, it is important to view their contributions in the context of the global marketplace as well as the U.S. economy and work force. This context also includes the urgent need to prepare for the jobs of the future. In particular, I will discuss work and family issues, preparation for employment by women on welfare and, briefly, Women's Bureau initiatives.

As members of the Subcommittee already know, Secretary of Labor William E. Brock has made the Work Force 2000 Project the cornerstone of his stewardship in the U.S. Department of Labor. The Women's Bureau is proud to play an important role in the Work Force 2000 initiative.

This morning, I will also bring news of a recent study by the Hudson Institute on Work Force 2000, commissioned by the Labor Department. The study discusses the changes in the workplace that we can expect and the adjustments which will have to be made in our employment and training systems if our workers are to be well matched with tomorrow's employment demands.

Today, women are key players in our economy. The realization of their importance, however, has been gradual and uneven throughout society as more women have entered the labor force and have claimed long-term attachments to employment. The

same is true globally. As I travel internationally, I am impressed by the increasing recognition of women's key economic role. Awareness of the vital need for women workers in a healthy economy is heightening both among our principal trading partners and within other countries.

Today, in the United States, more than 52 million women age 16 and over are in the labor force, and only about 3.7 million of these women are among the unemployed. These millions of working women are now the majority of all women (55 percent) and comprise 44 percent of the entire labor force. By the year 2000, they are projected to comprise as much as 47 percent of the labor force. However, the key economic position of women in the labor force depends on more than what they have accomplished already. That is great in itself, since they have entered the labor force at the rate of more than one million a year for at least the last decade and a half, and have claimed more than one million new jobs in the past year alone. But the keys to their importance in the United States economy, and, in fact, in the economy of the global village are two:

> One, the economy in the United States has long been and, according to best estimates, will continue to be dominated by the services-producing sector, where women are the majority of workers and two, women will be the major source of new entrants into the labor market in the foreseeable future.

These two factors, together with the move of our economy toward increased international trade and competition, will have significant implications for the future of our nation.

To lay a groundwork for addressing these issues, let me briefly summarize the labor force status of women in the United States today. The majority (74 percent) of the 48.7 million employed women work full-time; that is, they work 35 or more hours per week. At the same time, the majority (75 percent) of the 3.7 million who are unemployed are seeking full-time work. We find that over half of wives and over half of all mothers (63 percent) are in the labor force. Wives have increased their participation, for example, from 46 percent in 1976 to 55 percent today. It is significant that the dual-earner family has become the predominant type of family in the United States. Another family type which is growing is the single-parent family. Families maintained by wage-earning women increased 25 percent from 5.4 million in 1979 to 6.7 million in 1986. Of course, the sole earner

in the overwhelming majority of these families is usually the woman. Some 62 percent of women who maintain families were in the labor force in 1986; but even in 1976, more than half were already working (55 percent). The impact of women as both workers and family members is significant.

Over the last decade and a half, women have made great strides in obtaining better paid employment as they have met, challenged, and conquered many barriers to their acceptance in the full range of jobs. The sharpest rates of increase for women have been in those jobs that require post-secondary education and/or skills training. For example, in 1970, women were 34 percent of all managerial and professional specialty workers, but by 1986 they were more than 43 percent. Women were only 1.7 percent of engineers in 1970, but they are 6 percent today, increasing their numbers from 35,000 to 105,000. Through their academic achievement, women, who were only 11 percent of engineering and science technicians (fewer than 100,000 strong) in 1970, were nearly a quarter million of these skilled workers by 1986, representing 20 percent of this work force. In 1970, women were only 19 percent of public officials and administrators, but by 1986, they had doubled their participation to 37 percent and increased their numbers from 1.1 million to more than 4.6 million. Women lawyers and judges were rare in 1970, at 14,000 nationwide or less than 5 percent of the total in these fields, but by 1986, there were 118,000 or 18 percent of the total. Yet, with all we have achieved, the largest number of women still are employed in the traditional female occupations, including teachers in elementary and secondary schools, clerical workers, nurses, food, health and service workers.

In the past five years or so, we have begun to see a trend toward reducing the earnings gap between women and men workers. Today, women employed full-time, year-round earn about 65 percent of what similarly employed men earn. This is up five percentage points since 1980.

Minority women also have made strides in the labor force over time. They, too, have confronted and conquered barriers, including sexual and racial bias. While their numbers and proportions of progress do not match the totals for all women job-for-job, there has been progress, for example, in executive, administrative and managerial jobs. In 1980, only 4.4 percent of black women were in those jobs; by 1986, 6.0 percent were so employed. At the same time, their high unemployment rates, particularly among black women between the ages of 16 and 24, have significant implications for the future labor force where minority women will have increased opportunities.

I have provided only a brief summary of women's status in the U.S. labor force. To further illuminate their status, I am submitting an appendix of a few tables of statistical data which will summarize women's recent labor force experience. In concluding this statistical overview, I want to emphasize that women already play an important role in the U.S. economy, but they will play an even more central role in its performance in the future. The heightening of the recognition of women's key role and what we need to do about it, is what I want to emphasize most. Women's concerns, you see, are now everyone's concern.

I. Projections for Change in the Work Force by the Year 2000

An increasing focus on the future has characterized much of the recent research and planning at the Department of Labor under Secretary Brock's focus on the Work Force 2000 Project. Two major reports have been shared recently with Members of this Subcommittee. First, the Bureau of Labor Statistics on June 25th released it's Preview of the Economy of the Year 2000, the 16th of its series of projections of long range economic growth. The following week Work Force 2000, Work and Workers for the 21st Century was issued by the Hudson Institute, a non-profit research organization which drew together a multidisciplinary team of professionals for this project.

While each report offered three alternative scenarios for growth of the economy and the work force, some themes were so predominant that they cannot be overlooked. For example, continued rapid growth of service industries will create most of the new jobs, including growth in business services and health care services. Many of the new jobs will require much higher skill levels than the jobs of today. Employment in broad occupational groups that requires the most educational preparation--such as executive, administrative and managerial work; professional work; and technical and support work--will grow faster than average. Very few new jobs will be created for those who cannot read, follow directions or understand mathematics. Further, the rapid shift in jobs, and the likelihood that many workers will have several quite different kinds of work in a lifetime, require a broad, basic level of education to facilitate the acquisition of new skills. Another major theme of both reports is that the work force will grow more slowly as the pool of young workers entering the labor market shrinks because of slower population growth. Women, minorities and immigrants will become a larger share of the new entrants than in the past.

The Hudson Institute report sets forth a number of major challenges to policymakers that stem from these expected trends of the future. First, the researchers see the growth of the U.S. economy as intimately related to the growth of the economies of other nations and the need for the United States to focus beyond its own share of world trade and to stimulate balanced world growth.

These researchers also find that the need to improve the education and preparation of all workers arises not only as jobs for new workers become more complex, but also as aging workers face change and the need to adapt. The vast increase in the number of jobs in the service industries demands that attention now be paid to increasing productivity in the service sector. We have tended to focus the productivity debate on the manufacturing sector where we have made significant gains. Now, we must take a look at removing barriers to competition in services and to investing in technologies that enhance productivity in the service sector.

Developing innovative strategies to reconcile the conflicting needs of women, work, and families is another challenge identified by the Hudson Institute report, as is the need to integrate black and Hispanic workers into the economy.

The fresh review of the trends and projections made in these recent analyses, and the sharpened focus on the challenges they imply, bring a powerful message as we look to the future. We have no choice but to change. While we have examined most of these issues before, it is now imperative that we act on them. If we do not invest more wisely in human development, if we do not take advantage of the opportunity to draw into the mainstream of the new work force those minorities, women and immigrants who have had marginal opportunity, if we do not do a fundamentally better job at education and training very soon, the loss to this nation will be irreparable. The shifts in demographics and the new employment opportunities offer a real chance for <u>good</u> jobs--but only if we are prepared. Public policy, private enterprise, non-profit institutions, all will be needed in this effort. This picture poses special opportunities and challenges for women workers and policymakers concerned about women's employment and employability. That new jobs will require more brain and less brawn can be good news for women. But we cannot assume that pockets of illiteracy will just disappear. The challenge for the growing numbers of women coming into the labor force will be to increase their job and/or career awareness and preparation. The challenge for employers and program providers will be to help women prepare for the more skilled jobs of the future.

II. Women's Bureau Initiatives

In light of these trends and challenges, the Women's Bureau is focusing on three major program areas: 1) balancing work and family; 2) work-related components of welfare reform; and 3) addressing grass-roots concerns of women workers throughout the country.

In the realm of balancing work and family, we have already found that forward-looking employers are beginning to recognize that employees' personal and professional responsibilities affect the workplace, productivity, the family, and society overall. Yet, the vast majority of employment practices, policies, and benefits continue to address the needs of a bygone era when it was assumed that one family member stayed at home to look after the household needs of the entire family.

The social and economic conditions of today and the ones we anticipate for tomorrow, require a new perspective. Flexibility in hours of work and leave patterns, a variety of means of providing assistance with respect to child care and elder care, flexible benefit packages that make the same number of dollars fit the needs of different workers, prorated benefits for part-time employees, are all areas for constructive employment policies which we will continue to bring to the attention of employers, employees, unions, and others.

In addition, the Women's Bureau is developing a clearinghouse to provide state-of-the-art information on trends and developments in the work and family area. The clearinghouse will draw on the knowledge of experts on work and family issues and encourage dialogue among these individuals. As such, this clearinghouse will provide a national focal point for identifying emerging work and family issues and options for addressing those issues. When fully operational, it will be a resource for policy officials, legislators, employers, unions, researchers, and others who require the highest quality information available to support making decisions in work and family areas. Completion of the design of the clearinghouse information base and the start of collection and entry of information into the system is scheduled for the fall of this year.

I would like to shift now to another important area: our special concern for women on welfare. In response to their needs, the Women's Bureau has entered the dialogue on welfare reform and has begun to encourage commissions on women and other women's groups also to enter the dialogue. Ninety percent of persons on welfare are women and children; most

of the women are potential members of the work force if not already working at least part-time. More than 2 million women worked full-time last year and still earned poverty level incomes. The more closely welfare programs become tied to preparation for employment, the more the Women's Bureau needs to contribute to policy formulation. A number of significant experiments have been carried on in recent years in the States, and there has been time for some evaluation and sharing of results.

In the months ahead, the Women's Bureau expects to join with others in identifying exemplary welfare reform initiatives emerging in local communities and in discussing with policy-makers the kinds of programs that bring the most effective and lasting results.

We already know that it takes basic remedial education and adequate skills training to lead to good wages, that is, wages that can support a family. Support services, primarily child care, permit a mother to participate in training and employment and a carefully planned transition program can prevent the loss of health benefits, thus eliminating deterrents to labor force participation. Some communities have made special efforts to place former welfare recipients in jobs that offer health insurance; other communities have phased out such benefits gradually to ease the transition to self-sufficiency. We, in the Women's Bureau, are advocating a holistic approach that looks at the individual's total needs and, then, focuses the resources of the whole community in meeting those needs. This approach taps into the dreams and aspirations of the participant and helps her and her family to set realistic goals.

We need communities that strengthen families. Changes in family status, divorce, separation, or teenage pregnancy out of wedlock, are the predominant events that contribute to women's dependency on welfare. Moving off of welfare, on the other hand, is most frequently associated with marriage and children leaving the family home. Women on welfare need an opportunity to break out of isolation. They need contact with successful role models to help open their eyes and those of their children to the wide range of opportunities available to them. Initiatives such as these can come from local communities as well as from non-profit organizations.

Finally, as we approach the challenges of a new century, the Women's Bureau mandate--given to us by Congress in 1920--is more relevant than ever. Promoting the welfare of working

women, improving their working conditions, increasing their efficiency and advancing their opportunities for profitable employment are not only noble goals, they are essential when viewed in the context of year 2000 projections.

The future will mean new opportunitites for those who are prepared. The national and grass-roots initiatives we undertake are designed to make a difference for those whose lives we touch. The Women's Bureau is more than national policy papers, statistical analyses, and published reports. The Bureau is also demonstration projects for women veterans in Seattle, for handicapped women in Philadelphia, for immigrant women in Brownsville, Texas, and much more. Our impact is measured in human terms, which cannot be easily quantified. Serving as chief federal advocate for the 52 million women in the work force, the Women's Bureau is helping to lay the groundwork so that women, their families, employers, unions and other groups can be as well prepared as possible for the year 2000 and beyond.

Table 1. Employment Status of Women in the Civilian Noninstitutional Population 16 Years and Older, by Race 1972-1986

(Numbers in thousands)

Year	Civilian noninstitutional population	Civilian Labor Force					Not in labor force
		total	Percent of population	Employed	Unemployed Number	Unemployed Percent of labor force	
All Women[1]							
1972	76,290	33,479	43.9	31,257	2,222	6.6	42,811
1973	77,804	34,804	44.7	32,715	2,089	6.0	43,000
1974	79,312	36,211	45.7	33,769	2,441	6.7	43,101
1975	80,860	37,475	46.3	33,989	3,486	9.3	43,386
1976	82,390	38,983	47.3	35,615	3,369	8.6	43,406
1977	83,840	40,613	48.4	37,289	3,324	8.2	43,227
1978	85,334	42,631	50.0	39,569	3,061	7.2	42,703
1979	86,843	44,235	50.9	41,217	3,018	6.8	42,608
1980	88,348	45,487	51.5	42,117	3,370	7.4	42,861
1981	89,618	46,696	52.1	43,000	3,696	7.9	42,922
1982	90,748	47,755	52.6	43,256	4,499	9.4	42,993
1983	91,884	48,583	52.9	44,047	4,457	9.2	43,181
1984	92,778	49,709	53.6	45,915	3,794	7.6	43,068
1985	93,736	51,050	54.5	47,259	3,791	7.4	42,686
1986	94,789	52,413	55.3	48,706	3,707	7.1	42,376
White Women							
1972	67,431	29,157	43.2	27,426	1,733	5.9	38,274
1973	68,317	30,231	44.1	28,623	1,606	5.3	38,286
1974	69,623	31,437	45.2	29,511	1,927	6.1	38,186
1975	70,810	32,508	45.9	29,714	2,794	8.6	38,302
1976	71,974	33,735	46.9	31,078	2,656	7.9	38,239
1977	73,077	35,108	48.0	32,550	2,558	7.3	37,969
1978	74,213	36,679	49.4	34,392	2,287	6.2	37,534
1979	75,347	38,067	50.5	35,807	2,260	5.9	37,280
1980	76,489	39,127	51.2	36,587	2,540	6.5	37,362
1981	77,428	40,157	51.9	37,394	2,762	6.9	37,271
1982	78,230	41,010	52.4	37,615	3,395	8.3	37,220
1983	78,884	41,541	52.7	38,272	3,270	7.9	37,343
1984	79,624	42,431	53.3	39,659	2,772	6.5	37,193
1985	80,306	43,455	54.1	40,690	2,765	6.4	36,851
1986	81,042	44,284	55.0	41,876	2,708	6.1	36,458
Black Women							
1972	7,988	3,890	48.7	3,433	458	11.8	4,098
1973	8,214	4,052	49.3	3,601	451	11.1	4,162
1974	8,462	4,148	49.0	3,677	470	11.3	4,314
1975	8,691	4,247	48.9	3,618	629	14.8	4,444
1976	8,931	4,460	49.9	3,823	637	14.3	4,471
1977	9,174	4,670	50.9	3,975	695	14.9	4,504
1978	9,394	4,997	53.2	4,307	690	13.8	4,397
1979	9,636	5,119	53.1	4,436	683	13.3	4,517
1980	9,880	5,253	53.1	4,515	738	14.0	4,627
1981	10,102	5,401	53.5	4,561	840	15.6	4,701
1982	10,300	5,527	53.7	4,552	975	17.6	4,773
1983	10,477	5,681	54.2	4,622	1,059	18.6	4,796
1984	10,694	5,907	55.2	4,995	911	15.4	4,787
1985	10,873	6,144	56.5	5,231	913	14.9	4,729
1986	11,033	6,281	56.9	5,386	894	14.2	4,752

[1] Total includes women of other races not shown separately.

Source: Prepared by Women's Bureau from data published in Employment and Earnings, January 1987, Labor Force Statistics Derived from the Current Population Survey: A Databook Vol. I Bulletin 2096, September 1983, BLS, and unpublished data from BLS, U.S. Department of Labor.

Table 2.

Employed Women 16 Years and Older,
by Occupation
1970, 1980 and 1986

(Numbers in thousands)

Occupation	1970		1980		1986	
	Number	% of total	Number	% of total	Number	% of total
Total	30,347	38.0	44,304	42.6	48,706	44.4
Managerial and professional specialty	5,004	33.9	9,196	40.6	11,525	43.4
Executive, administrative & managerial	1,102	18.5	3,169	30.5	4,653	36.8
Officials and administrators, public administration	54	19.0	114	30.9	214	40.1
Other executive, administrative and managerial	664	16.6	2,056	27.8	3,842	33.8
Management related occupations	384	22.7	999	38.2	1,597	44.3
Professional specialty	3,902	44.3	6,027	49.1	6,872	49.4
Engineers	21	1.7	65	4.8	105	6.0
Mathematical and computer scientists	53	16.7	86	26.1	218	36.1
Natural scientists	31	13.4	61	19.9	84	22.2
Health diagnosing occupations	36	8.0	76	11.8	109	15.0
Health assessment and treating occupations	847	84.7	1,482	86.0	1,738	85.3
Teachers, college and university	148	39.1	233	36.6	230	36.0
Teachers, except college and university	2,084	70.5	2,631	70.8	2,611	73.4
Lawyers and judges	14	4.6	74	14.0	118	18.1
Other professional specialty occupations	686	36.2	1,313	44.2	1,654	44.6
Technical, sales and administrative support	13,399	59.0	19,882	64.4	22,333	66.7
Technicians and related support	627	54.4	1,341	62.8	1,581	67.0
Health technologists and technicians	91	72.3	181	78.3	241	84.1
Engineering and science technicians	98	16.9	319	19.3	334	20.0
Technicians, except health, engineering, and science	81	21.3	295	31.6	413	37.4
Sales occupations	3,310	41.3	4,993	48.7	6,282	48.3
Supervisors and proprietors	99	13.7	319	28.3	1,044	36.5
Sales representatives, finance and business services	193	17.4	654	35.4	935	41.5
Sales representatives, commodities, except retail	73	6.6	188	14.5	276	18.3
Sales workers, retail and personal services	2,814	62.1	3,693	67.1	4,061	68.6
Sales related occupations	13	44.8	13	34.8	42	64.6
Administrative support, including clerical	9,661	73.1	13,548	77.1	14,260	80.4
Supervisors	114	51.4	103	47.1	231	55.3
Computer equipment operators	70	41.5	148	59.2	389	68.5
Secretaries, stenographers, and typists	3,993	98.9	4,249	98.2	4,832	98.2
Financial records processing	1,713	80.7	3,047	88.4	3,324	90.8
Mail and message distributing	193	34.7	140	39.9	311	34.4
Other administrative support, including clerical	3,561	61.6	5,735	70.8	5,832	74.4
Service occupations	4,084	39.7	8,031	38.9	8,905	40.7
Private household	1,144	96.1	597	95.3	942	96.0
Protective service	70	6.6	182	11.8	221	12.4
Service, except private household and protective	4,848	61.3	7,241	63.3	7,742	65.0
Food service	2,477	68.5	3,185	65.9	3,219	62.8
Health service	1,038	87.6	1,611	88.1	1,639	89.9
Cleaning and building service	704	32.0	1,049	33.1	1,187	41.5
Personal service	835	68.4	1,395	77.6	1,698	80.8

Table 2.--continued.

Employed Women 16 Years and Older,
by Occupation
1970, 1980 and 1986

(Numbers in thousands)

Occupation	1970		1980		1986	
	Number	% of total	Number	% of total	Number	% of total
Precision production, craft, and repair	824	7.3	1,056	7.8	1,150	8.6
Mechanics and repairers	80	2.5	135	3.4	131	3.5
Construction trades	61	1.7	102	3.1	99	2.0
Other precision production, craft and repair	683	15.6	819	17.2	900	21.9
Operators, fabricators, and laborers	4,498	25.9	5,486	27.4	4,335	25.4
Machine operators, assemblers, and inspectors	3,547	39.7	4,102	40.7	3,187	40.3
Manufacturing industries	425	30.7	623	34.3	2,706	40.9
Durable goods	266	31.2	346	31.8	1,121	30.5
Nondurable goods	160	29.9	277	38.1	1,585	53.8
Nonmanufacturing industries	33	25.1	80	27.9	481	37.1
Transportation and material moving occupations	163	4.1	375	7.8	406	8.9
Motor vehicle operators	133	4.9	299	9.1	367	10.9
Other transportation and material moving occupations	31	2.5	76	4.9	39	3.3
Handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers	788	17.4	1,009	19.8	762	16.3
Construction laborers	11	1.9	27	3.2	21	2.8
Other handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers	776	19.8	982	23.2	741	18.8
Farming, forestry, and fishing	277	9.1	451	14.9	548	15.9
Farm operators and managers	72	5.0	130	9.9	188	14.1
Other farming, forestry, and fishing occupations	205	12.8	321	18.7	360	17.1

Source: Compiled by the Women's Bureau from Employment and Earnings, Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, January 1987 and, Detailed Occupation of the Experienced Labor Force by Sex for the United States and Regions: 1980 and 1970, Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce.

Table 3.

Comparison of Median Earnings of Year-Round Full-Time Workers, by Sex, 1955-1985

(Persons 15 years of age and over)

Year	Median earnings Women (1)	Men (2)	Earnings gap in current dollars (3)	Women's earnings as a percent of men's (4)	Percent men's earnings exceeded women's (5)	Earnings gap in constant 1987 dollars (6)
1985	$15,624	$24,195	$8,571	64.6	54.9	$2,660
1984	14,780	23,218	8,438	63.7	57.1	2,712
1983	13,915	21,881	7,966	63.6	57.2	2,670
1982	13,014	21,077	8,063	61.7	62.0	2,789
1981	12,001	20,260	8,259	59.2	68.8	3,032
1980	11,197	18,612	7,415	60.2	66.2	3,004
1979	10,151	17,014	6,863	59.7	67.6	3,137
1978	9,350	15,730	6,380	59.4	68.2	3,267
1977	8,618	14,626	6,008	58.9	69.7	3,310
1976	8,099	13,455	5,356	60.2	66.1	3,141
1975	7,504	12,758	5,254	58.8	70.0	3,239
1974	6,772	11,833	5,063	57.2	74.8	3,433
1973	6,335	11,186	4,851	56.6	76.6	3,649
1972	5,903	10,202	4,299	57.9	72.8	3,435
1971	5,593	9,399	3,806	59.5	68.0	3,136
1970	5,323	8,966	3,643	59.4	68.4	3,133
1969	4,977	8,227	3,250	60.5	65.3	2,961
1968	4,457	7,664	3,207	58.2	72.0	3,079
1967	4,150	7,182	3,032	57.8	73.1	3,032
1966	3,973	6,848	2,875	58.0	72.4	3,958
1965	3,823	6,375	2,552	60.0	66.8	3,700
1964	3,690	6,195	2,505	59.6	67.9	3,969
1963	3,561	5,978	2,417	59.6	67.9	3,637
1962	3,446	5,974	2,528	59.5	73.4	3,790
1961	3,331	5,644	2,293	59.4	68.4	3,559
1960	3,293	5,317	2,124	60.8	64.5	3,394
1959	3,193	5,209	2,016	61.3	63.1	3,308
1958	3,102	4,927	1,825	63.0	58.8	2,108
1957	3,008	4,713	1,705	63.8	56.7	2,023
1956	2,827	4,436	1,639	63.3	58.9	2,014
1955	2,719	4,252	1,533	63.9	56.4	1,911

Notes: From 1967 forward, data include wage and salary income and earnings from self-employment; for 1955-66, data include wages and salaries only. Persons 15 years and over beginning with 1979; persons 14 years old and over for previous years.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census: "Money Income of Families and Persons in the United States," Current Population Reports, 1957 to 1984 and "Money Income and Poverty Status of Families and Persons in the United States: 1985." (Advance Report), and Bureau of Labor Statistics.

79-107 O - 87 - 2

Table 4.

Families by Type and Number of Wage and Salary Earners, 1979 and 1986

(Numbers in thousands)

Characteristic	Number of families 1979	Number of families 1986	Percent distribution 1979	Percent distribution 1986	Percent Change 1979 - 1986
TOTAL					
Families with wage or salary earners[1]	40,613	42,101	100.0	100.0	3.7
One earner	19,414	18,789	47.8	44.6	-3.2
Two or more earners	21,199	23,312	52.2	55.4	10.0
Married-couple families	33,701	33,569	100.0	100.0	-0.4
One earner	14,735	13,049	43.7	38.9	-11.4
Husband	12,372	9,979	36.7	29.7	-19.3
Wife	1,791	2,351	5.3	7.0	31.3
Other family member	573	719	1.7	2.1	25.5
Two or more earners	18,966	20,520	56.3	61.1	8.2
Husband and wife only[2]	15,867	14,347	47.1	42.7	-9.6
Husband, wife, and other family member(s)	N/A	3,397	N/A	10.1	N/A
Husband, and other family member(s)	2,596	2,056	7.7	6.1	-20.8
Wife and other family member(s)	365	532	1.1	1.6	45.8
Other family members only	138	188	.4	.6	36.2
Families maintained by women	5,388	6,718	100.0	100.0	24.7
One earner	3,750	4,607	69.6	68.6	22.9
Householder	2,895	3,606	53.7	53.7	24.6
Other family member	854	1,001	15.8	14.9	17.2
Two or more earners	1,638	2,110	30.4	31.4	28.8
Families maintained by men	1,324	1,814	100.0	100.0	19.0
One earner	929	1,133	61.0	62.4	22.0
Householder	N/A	900	N/A	49.6	N/A
Other family member	N/A	232	N/A	12.8	N/A
Two or more earners	595	681	39.0	37.6	14.5

NA = Not available

1/ Excludes families where the husband, wife, or householder is self-employed.

2/ Husband, wife and other family members included in 1979.

Source: Prepared by Women's Bureau from Current Population Survey, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

(Number in thousands)

Family relationship	Civilian labor force					Not in labor force				
	Total	Percent of Population	Employed	Unemployed Number	Unemployed Percent of labor force	Total	Keeping House	Going to school	Unable to Work	Other reasons
1976										
Total, 16 years and over	96,158	61.6	88,752	7,406	7.7	59,991	34,782	7,799	2,866	14,544
Husbands 1/	40,791	87.2	39,081	1,711	4.2	8,868	110	262	1,211	7,285
With employed wife	18,644	91.7	17,949	715	3.8	1,691	29	146	362	1,154
With unemployed wife	1,393	92.5	1,226	166	11.9	112	2	11	33	66
With wife not labor force	19,359	74.7	18,620	739	3.8	6,594	53	84	741	5,716
Wives	21,858	45.6	20,353	1,504	6.9	25,955	24,120	251	248	1,336
With employed husband	19,176	50.6	17,949	1,226	6.4	18,621	17,544	209	88	779
With unemployed husband	880	54.3	714	166	18.9	739	694	12	11	22
With husband not in labor force	1,802	21.5	1,689	112	6.2	6,594	5,882	29	149	534
Women who maintain families	4,255	55.3	3,828	428	10.1	3,433	2,873	95	122	343

Family relationship	Civilian labor force					Not in labor force				
	Total	Percent of population	Employed	Unemployed Number	Unemployed Percent of labor force	Total	Keeping House	Going to school	Unable to work	Other reasons
1986										
Total, 16 years and over 1/	93,304	65.8	89,478	6,826	7.1	50,115	24,041	6,863	2,026	17,185
Husbands	39,433	78.3	37,773	1,448	4.2	10,812	179	184	867	9,582
With employed wife	24,063	91.7	23,173	890	3.7	2,184	69	102	306	1,707
With unemployed wife	1,246	91.8	1,082	164	13.2	111	3	4	23	81
With wife not labor force	14,114	62.4	13,520	593	4.2	8,517	107	78	539	7,793
Wives	27,605	55.0	26,247	1,357	4.9	22,631	19,007	324	304	2,996
With employed husband	24,255	64.2	23,173	1,082	4.5	13,520	12,215	267	96	942
With unemployed husband	1,055	64.0	890	164	15.6	593	526	18	11	38
With husband not in labor force	2,295	21.2	2,184	111	4.8	8,517	6,265	39	197	2,016
Women who maintain families	6,394	61.7	5,763	631	9.9	3,570	2,871	157	167	775

1/ Excludes persons living alone or with nonrelatives, persons in married-couple families where the husband or wife is in the Armed Forces, and persons in unrelated subfamilies.

Source: Labor Force Statistics Derived From the Current Population Survey: A Databook, Vol. I, Bureau of Labor Statistics Bulletin 2096, September 1982, and Employment and Earnings, January 1987.

Table 6.

Number of Own Children Under 18 Years of Age By Type of Family and Labor Force Status of Mother, March, Selected Years

(Numbers in thousands)

Year	Total Number of own children	Mother in labor force	Mother not in labor force	Married-couple families			Families maintained by women[1]			Families maintained by men[1]
				Total	Mother in labor force	Mother not in labor force	Total	Mother in labor force	Mother not in labor force	
Children under 18 years of age										
1970	63,733	23,344	33,330	48,199	21,282	26,917	6,403	1,962	2,133	931
1975	63,441	28,479	27,167	47,141	25,184	21,956	9,115	3,146	4,134	773
1980	64,514	31,329	23,366	44,193	25,972	18,221	10,361	4,512	3,542	973
1986	58,546	34,066	23,081	45,819	26,778	19,041	11,328	7,188	4,040	1,398
Children 6 to 17 years of age										
1970	44,149	19,954	23,427	40,778	17,933	22,844	3,103	1,919	2,183	768
1975	44,318	22,898	21,975	38,784	19,784	19,000	5,289	4,314	1,976	644
1980	41,788	23,825	17,148	33,032	18,357	14,697	7,961	5,300	2,661	796
1986	38,737	24,595	13,462	33,033	18,357	11,115	6,101	5,355	2,547	603
Children under 6 years of age										
1970	19,606	3,390	13,923	17,920	4,947	12,973	1,595	643	950	93
1975	17,344	6,581	11,281	13,598	5,500	10,098	2,344	1,081	1,183	82
1980	17,227	7,503	10,040	12,125	6,066	8,177	2,420	1,511	1,203	184
1986	19,809	9,574	9,419	16,167	8,241	7,926	5,226	1,733	1,492	416

[1] Families maintained by widowed, divorced, separated, or single persons.

Source: Prepared by the Women's Bureau from Labor Force Statistics Derived from the Current Population Survey: A Databook, Vol. I., Bulletin 2096, Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, September 1982 and for 1986 from unpublished data from the March 1986 Current Population Survey, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Table 7.

Number and Percent of Women With Poverty Level Incomes by Work Experience, 1972 -1985

(Numbers in thousands)

	1985		1984		1983		1982		1981	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total Women with Poverty Level Incomes	13,277	13.0	13,291	14.1	14,198	15.1	13,876	14.9	13,248	14.4
Worked last year	4,549	7.3	4,446	7.8	4,580	8.3	4,452	8.1	4,293	8.3
Full-time	2,168	5.7	2,177	6.0	2,187	6.3	2,148	6.3	2,164	6.5
Did not work last year	8,897	22.6	8,947	22.5	9,617	23.9	9,424	23.1	8,955	22.5
White women with Poverty Level Incomes	9,477	11.3	9,394	11.3	9,931	12.1	9,640	12.0	9,198	11.6
Worked last year	3,319	6.6	3,322	6.8	3,418	7.3	3,353	7.3	3,263	7.5
Full-time	1,553	4.9	1,568	4.9	1,618	5.3	1,633	5.3	1,563	5.3
Did not work last year	6,238	18.5	6,125	18.2	6,468	18.7	6,366	18.4	6,083	17.9
Black women with Poverty Level Incomes	3,494	31.0	3,584	33.3	3,837	35.7	3,828	33.8	3,681	33.0
Worked last year	1,133	11.2	1,037	11.3	1,031	11.3	1,043	11.5	1,044	11.7
Full-time	555	11.6	537	11.8	583	11.8	563	11.5	564	11.7
Did not work last year	2,367	48.4	2,531	51.7	2,844	54.7	2,764	55.1	2,612	53.0

	1980		1979		1978		1977		1976	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total Women with Poverty Level Incomes	12,869	12.5	10,638	12.1	10,678	12.0	10,316	12.0	10,494	12.4
Worked last year	1,937	5.9	1,751	5.3	1,806	5.5	1,696	5.4	1,829	5.9
Full-time	1,097	5.3	1,051	5.1	1,066	5.3	1,020	5.4	1,079	5.5
Did not work last year	8,537	21.3	7,340	19.5	7,291	18.5	7,336	18.3	7,380	18.2
White women with Poverty Level Incomes	8,468	10.8	7,293	9.5	7,330	9.5	7,310	9.5	7,389	9.8
Worked last year	2,760	6.3	2,566	5.8	2,542	5.8	2,446	5.8	2,531	6.4
Full-time	1,414	4.7	1,181	4.0	1,348	4.4	1,316	4.5	1,351	4.6
Did not work last year	5,709	17.0	5,027	15.5	4,988	14.6	4,960	14.3	5,057	14.6
Black women with Poverty Level Incomes	3,637	33.2	3,081	31.4	3,108	31.4	3,113	32.1	3,019	31.2
Worked last year	1,045	10.8	933	11.4	933	10.1	847	11.5	847	12.1
Full-time	517	12.8	536	13.1	538	13.3	646	13.5	647	13.8
Did not work last year	2,386	49.9	2,130	48.1	2,157	46.5	2,235	47.7	2,162	45.8

Table 7.--continued

	1973		1974		1973		1972	
	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total women with Poverty Level Income	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Worked last year Full-time	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Did not work last year	7,387	18.2	6,904	17.3	6,399	16.7	7,363	18.1
White women with Poverty Level Income	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Worked last year Full-time	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Did not work last year	5,309	14.7	4,872	13.9	4,659	13.4	5,331	14.7
Black women with Poverty Level Income	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Worked last year Full-time	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Did not work last year	2,063	45.5	1,943	44.4	1,856	43.8	1,937	44.1

Note: Persons age 14 years and older 1973 onward; persons aged 16 years and older 1971-1972.

Source: 1985, Unpublished data, Current Population Survey Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce. 1973-1984, "Characteristics of the Population Below the Poverty Level," Current Population Reports, Series P-60, Numbers 97, 101, 104, 111; 107, 112, 114, 123, 132, 137, 140, 152, Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Ms. Craft.

STATEMENT OF CHRISTINE CRAFT, NEWS DIRECTOR AND CO-ANCHOR, KRBK-TV, SACRAMENTO, CA

Ms. CRAFT. Thank you very much for asking me to be here. I have been asked to speak a little bit on the question of women on non-traditional jobs.

As a reporter, from my first perspective, in addition to being an anchorperson and a news director, from a reporter's perspective, if you consider the question of American women in non-traditional jobs, it is very hard not to start at the top. In this greatest country which is ours, the gospel is preached relentlessly of justice for all, and yet, it is still true that she, whether enormously qualified—that enormously qualified "she" who seriously considers for running for President is dismissed all too quickly as something none other than a sacrificial lamb. We have a long way to go.

If you go overseas across one ocean you find Mrs. Thatcher who has just won a whopping re-election bid. Across the other ocean there is Corazon Aquino, who is the heart and mind of the Philippine people's democratic revolution. Other countries have learned to trust women as leaders, but not ours.

In this Congress and in the legislatures of all 50 States, female faces are still few and far between. Representation on the Federal bench is still fractional, and I guess at least one-ninth or, I guess right now, one-eighth of the U.S. Supreme Court is female.

In the world of news, specifically television news, the Radio and Television News Directors' Association is publishing a study in September coming up, and it shows gains for female news directors. Back in 1985, only ten percent of the Nation's television news directors were women. There has been a whopping increase. We are now up to 14 percent. That means there are 110 female television directors, or there were last year, up from 75 the year before.

In looking at those numbers, you do see an increase, but it is also important to remember that women, as far as I know, are still more than 50 percent of the American society. There is absolutely no gender-specific trait that makes anyone, anyone a better reporter, a better news director, anchor, judge, legislator, or national leader. There is, however, still today a males-only tradition that still to a great extent bars women from staking their representative positions in the halls of power, corporate, legislative, and otherwise.

If you are lucky, you work for a company that gives women promotions to those middle-management positions. Where I work there are women department heads in programming, promotions, traffic, and news divisions. I am very lucky. I have a general manager, an enlightened one, who makes a conscious effort to instill good management skills in all his middle-management employees, male or female.

But from the women I talk to at other television stations and women in other lines of work, I learned very quickly that women managers are often not given the same amount of time to prove their theories as are male counterparts, even those with lesser

skills. Women in non-traditional jobs often have extra jobs, just dispelling the myths that abound about women and authority.

There is a very good argument that you cannot legislate equality, any more than you should legislate superiority. But I don't think that there should be any question in this country that the proper role of good government is to promote justice and equity of opportunity for all.

There are, as you well know, legislative proposals which directly attempt to do just this. Day care, insurance reform, tax incentives for companies which establish those sorts of programs, pension reform, those are all proper topics for deliberations by this body and by the States.

We have now a national dialogue on the subject of judicial interpretations of constitutional law and just how close the modern jurists should stick to the intent of the framers, those freedom fighting fathers. We must remember that those fathers were wealthy older white men who condoned slavery and the non-enfranchisement of women. The lessons of our history have shown that neither blacks nor women have been content to accept second-class citizenship. They rightfully see a birthright of equality, and intend to continue to claim it.

I don't think that any wise person, least of all those in public life, would disregard that reality. Real social change in our country does not come about solely because of legal challenges to the practices of discrimination. It comes via other routes as well. First and foremost among those is public dialogue. And that, I think, should logically be followed by legislative action to promote opportunity based on ability.

From my experience challenging the sexism of an industry, the broadcast industry, that used to discard women after the first crow's foot, I report that some progress has been made in on-air television news. One of the most popular anchors in the country in New York City is a 50 plus woman, Pat Harper. In San Francisco at the NBC affiliate, another grown-up, Sylvia Chase, sits at the anchor desk. And from Sacramento's KRBK, the aging, unattractive, and even less deferential to men than ever, Christine Craft coanchors the nightly news and functions as news director as well.

The role models in our society need to represent a broader base of American women, not just the young, nubile, poreless ingenue. Nothing wrong with being any of those things. I don't wish to disparage the young, nubile or the poreless. But those media images say an awful lot. In our biggest national drama of late, right down the hall out here, I doubt if there was any politically astute woman in American who could not have failed to notice in the Iran-Contra telecasts that in that biggest national drama the characters are almost all male. There have been no female counsel or committee members—maybe some behind the scenes counsel. They don't speak. They don't have speaking roles.

The major female witness was not only young, nubile and poreless, but came across equipped with a conveniently blind loyalty that saw going beyond written law, in her own words, as her master's wish.

And beyond the beautifully deferential Fawn Hall was Lieutenant Colonel North's best friend, a woman who knew a buffoon

when she saw one, Betsy of the All-American good looks and the Peter Pan collars.

There were a few other women seen in the proceedings, none of them with speaking roles, no doubt they were legal and legislative aides. But much like the Soviet Politburo, our governing bodies remain bereft of females. Surely the constitutional separation of powers is a topic that both men and women find important.

I think that until that sort of representation changes, women who rise out of clerical or service jobs will still be considered as having non-traditional employment. Whose tradition?

I would urge this body to give thoughtful support to legislative solutions to workplace inequity. It is blatantly overdue. When we place our hands over our breasts in this bicentennial year, we women want to know that the word "justice for all" do include our gender.

Thank you.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Ms. Craft.

[Prepared statement of Christine Craft follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF CHRISTINE CRAFT, NEWS DIRECTOR AND CO-ANCHOR, KRBK-TV, SACRAMENTO, CA

From a reporter's perspective, considering the question of American women in non-traditional jobs, it is hard not to start at the top. In this greatest country...ours...the gospel is preached of justice for all. But she who seriously considers running for President is too quickly relegated to the role of sacrificial lamb.

Going overseas, across one ocean, we find Mrs. Thatcher who has just won a whopping re-election bid. Across the other ocean there is Corazon Aquino, the heart and mind of the Phillipine people's democratic revolution. Other countries have learned to trust women leaders, but not ours.

In this Congress and in the legislatures of all fifty states, female faces are still few and far between. Representation of the federal bench is still fractional. At least one/ninth or, rather, one/eighth of our Supreme Court is female.

In the world of news, specifically television news, the Radio and Television News Directors' Association is publishing a study this September which shows gains for female news directors. In 1985, ten percent of the nation's t.v. news directors were female. That percentage soared to fourteen percent in 1986. There were 110 female news directors last year...up from 75 the year before.

In looking at the numbers, sometimes it is good to remember that women are not a minority group. Females represent more than fifty percent of American society. There is absolutely no gender-specific trait that makes anyone a better reporter, anchor, news director, judge, legislator, or national leader. There is, however, a males-only

tradition that still to a great extent bars women from staking their representative positions in the halls of power, corporate or otherwise.

If you are lucky, you work for a company that gives women promotions to those middle-management positions. Where I work there are women department heads in programming, promotions, traffic, and news divisions. I have an enlightened General Manager who makes a conscious effort to instill good management skills in all his middle-management employees, male or female.

But from women I talk to at other stations and women in other lines of work, I know that women managers are often notgiven the same amount of time to prove their theories as are male counterparts with equal or lesser skills. Women in non-traditional jobs often have extra jobs, just dispelling the myths about women and authority.

There is a good argument that you can't legislate equality, any more than you should legislate superiority. But I don't think that there should be any question that the proper role of good government in this country should be to promote justice and equity of opportunity for all.

There are, as you know, legislative proposals which directly attempt to do just this. Day care, insurance reform, pension reform are all proper topics for deliberations by this body and by the states.

We have now a national dialogue on the subject of judicial interpretations of constitutional law and just how close the modern jurists should stick to the intent of the framers, those freedom fighting fathers...We must remember that those fathers were wealthy older white men who condoned slavery and the non-enfranchisement of women. The lessons of our history have shown that neither blacks nor women have been content to accept second-class citizenship. They rightfully see a birthright of equality, and intend to continue to claim it.

No wise person, least of all in public life, would disregard that reality. Real social change in our country does not come about soley because of the legal challenges to the practices of discrimination. It comes via other routes as well. First and foremost among those is public dialogue. That is logically followed by legislative action to promote opportunity based on ability.

From my experiences challenging the sexism of an industry that used to discard women after the first crow's foot, I report that progress has been made in on-air television news. One of the most popular anchors in the nation's biggest t.v. market...New York City..is a fifty-plus woman, Pat Harper. In San Francisco at the NBC affiliate, KRON-TV, a grown-up Sylvia Chase sits at the anchor desk. From Sacramento's KRBK, the aging, unattractive, even less-deferential-than-ever Christine Craft co-anchors the nightly news and functions as news director as well. The role models need to represent a broader base of American women, not just the young, nubile, poreless ingenue.

Not to disparage the young, the nubile, or the poreless, but those media images say so awfully much. I doubt if there was a politically astute woman in America who watched the Iran-Contra telecasts without noticing. In our biggest national drama of late, the characters are almost all male. There was no female counsel or committee-member. The major female witness was not only young, nubile, and poreless, but came across equipped with a conveniently blind loyalty that saw going beyond written law as her master's wish. Beyond the beautifully deferential Fawn Hall was Lieutenant Colonel North's best friend, a woman who knew a buffoon when she ~~say~~ saw one, Betsy of the the All-American good looks and Peter Pan collars. A few other women seen in the proceedings...none of them with speaking roles..no doubt

were legal and legislative aides. Much like the Soviet Politburo, our governing bodies remain berefit of females. Surely the constitutional separation of powers is a topic that both men and women find important. Until that sort of representation changes...women who rise out of clerical or service jobs will still be considered as having non-traditional employment. I would urge this body to give thoughtful support to legislative solutions to workplace inequity. It is blatantly overdue, When we place our hands over our breasts in this bicentennial year, we want to know that the words 'justice for all' do include our gender.

Christine Craft

Mr. MARTINEZ. Ms. McClendon.

STATEMENT OF SARAH McCLENDON, DIRECTOR AND WASHINGTON CORRESPONDENT, McCLENDON NEWS SERVICE

Ms. MCCLENDON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

You know, you are very unique in calling us in, asking us what do we need in the way of legislation. I don't know that it has ever happened before.

This is particularly fitting now that we are celebrating the 200th anniversary of the U.S. Constitution, which included the representation of slaves but paid no attention to women. In fact, the writers of that Constitution in their conversations and planning expressed fears about educating women.

I recently was called to Philadelphia to speak to the women of the Philadelphia area as they celebrated the Constitution in an old house that was current at the time they were writing the Constitution. They researched on this, and the conversation of the people of that day was women should not be educated. They should not go outside the home and pursue other areas aside from caring for children and waiting for husbands to come home.

Mr. Chairman, what we need is not diamonds and furs and clothes. We want to be taken into the network of citizens. We want to be treated as first class citizens in our government. This is an almost unheard of situation in government, for women to make policy. Can you think of any women in government who really make policy? I think you will agree with me that policy needs improvement.

This could be done by mandating in many ways an equal number of women as well as men on some of these commissions of government.

We want to make $1.00 for our work, and not 62 cents. And today she has told me it is up to 65 cents. But this is quite an increase in recent years. We want full access to credit and to government loans, not just laws in this field that do not really operate. Now, that is the truth. They have written some recent laws to try to help things, but they don't really operate.

We want equality in education and training so that we can get better jobs and get off welfare rolls. But we must have training to get those women off of those welfare rolls.

We do not want a double standard of insurance, different for men and women. We want Congress to override the giant insurance lobby that annually keeps legislative reforms from coming about in the insurance area. You had just as well face up to it. That insurance lobby has really got a stranglehold on this Congress.

We want women to be able to serve their country in defense wherever they are needed. And they will be needed. There are going to be fewer men of military age, and they are going to need these women. And we need these women to be trained well and to have some experience so that they can serve well.

I don't know whether you know it or not, but women have served in all of our wars, actually served as well as laundered the clothes and done the cooking. But they had to fight like the devil to get the

chance to serve. This was true in the Civil War and all the wars. Look at Clara Barton and look at Dr. Mary Walker, the only woman who ever got the Congressional Medal of Honor for her work as a surgeon on the battlefield. Yet, she was just a contract surgeon. They wouldn't take her into the service. Then they took the medal of honor away from her, and her family had to go get it back for her. And believe you me, it was a struggle for her to keep it.

Do-nothingness in laws has blocked women's progress. We do not need any more studies. We know what is wrong. We have been studied to death. This is true in civilian women and military women. And I want to say that Secretary Brock might have done a fine thing recently in spending all that government money in getting that male chauvinistic bunch of people at Hudson Institute to make a study for them, but Brock could have done better from his own experience in the Senate. He is a fine, decent man, and he had enough experience in the Senate to know. One time he got 3,000 letters from people in Tennessee saying, for God's sakes, get us more money so that we can have day care, have something done for these mentally retarded children down here so they don't have to go sit at home all the rest of their lives looking at the wall.

So I went down to the White House to carry this question, and got down there, and nobody knew what we were talking about. The White House, the bureaucracy was so ignorant of the needs of families and women that they couldn't understand. We had to get some government people and finally study it and prove it. They said, "Oh, we know what you are talking about now. You need day care."

It is like those southern governors coming to town recently and saying, "We have just discovered that there is teenage pregnancy. And if we got something done about this teenage pregnancy, we would have more people able to buy goods in our stores."

I don't know what you thought, but I thought it was pretty damn sorry.

Mainly, we need less slave labor by women in the home and in the job world, and I do mean slave labor. Someone has said that the country has been very fortunate in that it has had women to contributed so much to production at low wages. You're right. They have had less share of the educational opportunities and less chance at the job opportunities.

Look at the way they built this building in the first place. They built it with a swimming pool in the recreation department for the men members of Congress. The women members of Congress had to go in there later and have their own pool built because some of the men wanted to swim in the nude. When they built these gymnasiums all over the country for the schools at first, the taxpayers money went into a lot of that. The time, the access, the rules did not let women in. Then women went into the military, and they said, oh, you don't have enough upper body strength. Well, you can develop that upper body strength if you give us better facilities with taxpayers' money.

On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, think what an improvement could be brought about in our deficit if only women were allowed to get any jobs or better jobs and better pay. You know, the G.I.

bill showed that if you give people training, the G.I. Education bill showed that if you give people training, they will increase the revenue of the country greatly. Look how many of these House and Senate members went to school under the G.I. bill, and look how many other people in the corporate world went to school under the G.I. bill. They were able to increase the taxes amazingly because of their increase in education.

There would be less money paid out on welfare, on food stamps, on institutional care for those who have been subjected to poverty, malnutrition, illiteracy, mental illness.

I want you to know that when these women raise these children in poverty, and one in four children are being raised in poverty today, that these children, their bodies are hurt, their minds are hurt, their souls are hurt. The first few years of raising a child, you have to give into that child some security, some confidence. He doesn't get that raised in poverty. How can they compete with the Japanese on technology? And how can they run these sophisticated weapons which this Defense Department is buying if they haven't had good minds and bodies? They can't read, and they can't study well after they have been through poverty.

Every citizen should be guaranteed health care. It can be done. Let us pay a few extra dollars on taxes and get adequate, decent health care for everyone, as they have today in Canada. We should heed the bills introduced in Congress every year by Congressman Claude Pepper and Congressman Edward Roybal and others.

Now only the rich can afford to be ill, as we keep up this government-backed preposterous system of guaranteeing profits to profiteering hospitals and doctors and insurance corporations. Families today are forced from independence economically to poverty by the system. They even take away a man and woman's wealth when one spouse goes into the nursing home. They take away their wealth, they play down their wealth, and the government forces them to give all this money to the nursing homes so that they become impoverished. Then the woman or man left back home, not in the nursing home, doesn't have enough money to live on. She has to go to welfare.

The catastrophic illness bill which the House will consider this week is nothing but a band-aid.

The neglect of women in the legislative process has been soft-soaped for too long. When the Reagan administration's political office was preparing for their 1984 campaign, Ed Rollins, the political director, told the President that every program we have designed, we have cut back on women. So they said, we've got to do something.

They called in a quota of rich Republican women supporters for a White House luncheon with the President and sought to give the impression of helping women economically. They failed to mention that the poverty of women who head households and raise children makes them dependent on governmental survival programs. The number of women in poverty is growing daily, as is the number of homeless families now with children. And nothing is being done about it actually at the White House.

The White House asked me not very long ago, why do you think that this is a responsibility of the Federal Government? I said,

well, I'll give you two reasons. One reason is, most of your policy has caused this homelessness, your economic policies. And another reason is because you've got to coordinate what you're doing. You may not have to spend any more money if you would just coordinate the programs you already have. The volunteers are doing everything in the world they can about the homeless, but they can't take of the situation.

A study of the laws, regulations, policies and procedures undertaken by the Justice Department under President Gerald Ford in 1976 was finally completed in 1986, under Reagan; but since then, it has laid on a desk. It has not been implemented at all. Some practices have been corrected voluntarily by the agencies of Government along the way, but so far Congress has not been able to change these injustices.

Bickering between the political parties was partly to blame. But the White House has done nothing about this, particularly the changes needed in the Social Security Administration.

Many of the laws could be corrected easily if Congress would just vote for the Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution. It passed the Congress before and came within three states of being ratified.

Do you know why it was defeated? Largely because fundamentalists preachers, a lot of them in the South, who don't want women to go outside the home to work, they came out and said it would be a sin to vote for the Equal Rights Amendment. Hogwash.

Women are working because they have to, to support their children. Women really need enforcement of that limp law providing for collection of child support money for absconding fathers in other states. It isn't working.

Mostly what we women need is a change in attitude on the part of citizens. Men should not be reared to fight women's entrance into the military service academies as they did. Now we have women leading the classes. They are still fighting to keep women out of exclusive clubs. Men should not be treated lightly when they commit brutal rape, which is done about every three minutes in this country. Young executives should not be condoned in sexual harassment practices which pervades the corporate world. And it's terrible.

When Congress enacts stringent laws to assure equal pay for women, adequate training, better education, decent health care, and representation on Federal commissions, women will attain their rightful place in society.

Now, I can't give you all these statistics. I am not good on that like Shirley Dennis is and other people. And she had some very good ones. But I brought along some things for you today that I am going to leave for your reference library if you will take it, a lot of good material here. Statistics from the Women's Equity Action League; they have reports here on poverty, the elderly, the disabled, women in business, working mothers, all that. We have something here from the National Women's Party which shows how the Equal Rights Amendment is within, I think, two or three votes of being accepted in the Senate today. They haven't finished their survey of the House.

We've got a book here, The American Woman, which has just come out with Ford Foundation money. It is being introduced at a press conference across town at this moment. And it is supposed to be sort of a bible on women.

So I brought all these things along for you to have because I can't talk statistics. But I can talk other things.

Thank you, sir.

[Prepared statement of Sarah McClendon follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SARAH MCCLENDON, MCCLENDON NEWS SERVICE

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you on behalf of all women for this chance to report on our needs. I speak for women who work and women who may work in future. I might add that it is quite unique — I am not sure it has ever happened before — that a chairman of a Congressional committee has asked us to tell him what we need.

This is particularly fitting now that we are celebrating the 200th anniversary of the United States Constitution which included the representation of slaves but paid no attention to women. In fact, the writers of that Constitution in their conversations and planning expressed fears about educating women. They were concerned that that might lead women to go outside the home and pursue other areas aside from caring for children and waiting for the return home of husbands.

Mr. Chairman, what we need is not diamonds and furs and clothes. We want to be taken into the network of citizens. We want to be treated as first class citizens in our government. This is an almost unheard of situation in government, where women make policy. This could be done by mandating equal representation on commissions. You will agree with me, I am sure, that policy making needs improvement. We want to make $1 for our work, not 62 cents, an increase over recent years. We want full access to credit and to government loans, not just laws in this field that do not really operate.

We want equality in education and training so that we can get better jobs and get off welfare rolls. We must have training.

We do not want a double standard of insurance, different for men and women. We want Congress to over-ride the giant insurance lobby that annually keeps legislative reforms from coming about.

We want women to be able to serve their country in defense wherever they are needed. From the beginning of settling this continent, women have had to beg to be able to serve in wars and they are still being unnecessarily constricted. It is our country. We ought to be able to defend it where needed.

No nothingness in laws has blocked women's progress. We do not need any more studies. We know what is wrong. We have been studied to death. What we need is legislative action and action on the budget as well, for there are many programs involving women, children, and their health and educational needs which have been cut back by the Reagan administration.

Mainly, we need less slave labor by women, in the home and in the job world. Some one has said that the country has been very fortunate in that it had women who contributed so much to production at low wages. That is true. They have had less share of the educational opportunities and less chance at the job opportunities.

On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, think what an improvement could be brought about in our deficit if only women were allowed to get any jobs or better jobs and better pay. There would be less money paid out on welfare, on food stamps, on institutional care for those who have been subjected to poverty, malnutrition, illiteracy, mental illness.

Every citizen should be guaranteed health care. It can be done. Let us pay a few extra dollars on taxes and get adequate, decent health care for every one as they have today in Canada. We should but heed the bills introduced in Congress every year by Rep. Claude Pepper, Rep. Edward Roybal and others. Now only the rich can afford to be ill, as we keep up this government-backed preposterous system of guaranteeing profits to profiteering hospitals and doctors and insurance corporations. Families today are forced from independence economically to poverty by the system. The catastrophic illness bill which the House will consider this week is merely a band aid.

The neglect of women in the legislative process has been soft-soaped for too long. When the Reagan administrations' political office as preparing for his 1984 campaign,

they realized, according to Ed Rollins, the political director, that they had cut back nearly every program designed to help women. So they called in their quota of rich Republican women supporters for a White House luncheon with the president and sought to give the impression of helping women economically. They failed to mention that the poverty of women who head households and raise children makes them dependent on government survival programs. The number of women in poverty is growing daily as are the number of homeless families with children.

A study of the laws regulations, policies and procedures undertaken by the Justice Department under President Gerald Ford in 1976 was finally completed in 1986, under Reagan; but since then it has not been implemented. Some practices have been corrected voluntarily by the agencies of government but so far Congress has not implemented these injustices. Bickering between the political parties was partly to blame. But the White House has done nothing to implement the reports issued by Justice that show injustices must be overturned. Particularly is this true in Social Security Administration.

Many of these laws could be corrected easily if Congress would just vote for the Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution. It passed the Congress before and came within three states of being ratified. It was defeated largely by a fight by fundamentalist preachers who do not want women to go outside the home to work. But they have to, to support their children.

Women really need enforcement of that limp law providing for collection of child support money for absconding fathers in other states.

Mostly what we women need is a change in attitude on the part of citizens. Men should not be reared to fight women's entrance into the military, service academies, exclusive clubs. They should not be treated lightly when they commit brutal rape. Young executive should not be condoned in sexual harassment practices in the corporate world.

When Congress enacts stringent laws to assure equal pay for women, adequate training, better education, decent health care, and representation on federal commissions, women will attain their rightful place in society.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Ms. McClendon. All of those things that you have will be entered in the record if there is no objection.

I would appreciate that book that you have provided for us. After our staff has had time to go over it and gain the materials out of it, I am going to confiscate it for my own. Would you please autograph it?

Ms. MCCLENDON. I sure will.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Let me say that as you were speaking, I was conjuring up all kinds of ideas. I have to agree with you that we study things to death before we actually act. It is amazing how long it takes us up here on the Hill to understand and know things that are reality in everyday life. It just doesn't happen.

I will tell you that I do see some things changing. Recently in my district there was a young lady who wanted to enter in the service, and she was one inch too short. She wanted to join the Marines because her father had been a Marine, and her brothers had been Marines, and it was a tradition in their family to serve in the Marine Corps.

I'm a former Marine. Our staff went to bat for her, and they worked until they got the Marine Corps to reconsider, and she is now a recruit. She is doing a great job, and some day the Marine Corps is going to thank me because this lady is really dedicated to what she is doing.

Ms. MCCLENDON. Great.

Mr. MARTINEZ. But even where I see things changing, they are not changing fast enough or rapidly enough.

Ms. MCCLENDON. That's right.

Mr. MARTINEZ. I would like to ask all of you a question, and each one of you respond in turn. Because, you know, so many times when we are arguing for the rights of people, there are always people on the other side that are saying, well, you are creating reverse discrimination. It seems that some people have the mentality that any time that you try to rectify a wrong, you somehow are doing another wrong and simply saying, well, two wrongs don't make a right.

Well, that's baloney. If you try to rectify a wrong, you are doing a good right, and it is not creating reverse discrimination. Somehow we've got to change these people's mentality.

But in that same vein, they charge many times, when you champion for the things that are right, they are saying to you, well, this is just women's lib and other crazy notions. Respond to me why—this isn't just women's lib; this is just equality for all. You said, justice for all. It is equality for all. Our Constitution guarantees that.

But yet, I have people up here, saying, there is only one reason for the Federal Government to exist at all, and that's to provide for the common defense, and the Constitution says so, which they are reading from the Preamble. But they forget there are seven other reasons if you really read that Preamble closely, why we established that Constitution in order to form a more perfect union. And one of them was to provide for the common good. Well, you can't provide for the common good unless you provide for all the people within that society.

But respond to me why, and answer the charges, that this is just crazy women's lib.

Ms. Dennis.

Ms. DENNIS. I would like to respond to that, Mr. Chairman. I think, first of all, that affirmative action is very much needed in this country. I consider myself to be a product of affirmative action.

On the other hand, I think that there is no need for affirmative action to be a political football or to threaten everyone in the workplace. I think that affirmative action is what you have in a pluralistic society when the goal is to bring everyone into participation in the society.

What I think is also very good news in terms of the Work Force 2000 Project is the fact that as the population grows more slowly and the work force grows more slowly, women, minorities and immigrants will be needed in the workplace. There will not be enough male white men to fill all the jobs. So I believe that affirmative action will be less of an issue as we begin to move into the 21st century.

And let me hasten to add, I am not talking about a distant future. I am talking about a time that is upon us that we must simply recognize.

Thank you.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you.

Ms. Craft.

Ms. CRAFT. I guess I have to speak from my own experience. People thought I filed a lawsuit because they told me I was too unattractive and too old to do the news. That's not true. The real reason I made a Federal case out of my situation in Missouri was that they told me, they said, "Christine, you don't hide your intelligence, you know, to make the guys look smarter. For example, you know the difference between the American and the National League. People of Kansas City just don't like that."

Well, as an eighth generation American whose fathers—my paternal lineage comes from Jamestown, Virginia, I think that knowing the difference between the American and the National League is a birthright. I have every intentions of continuing to know the difference.

I cannot myself say, "Oh, Fred, you have highlights of the morning's game now, don't you? The Orioles, is that the team with the little birds?"

So really urged on more by that sense of what was a birthright to know, that there should be no prerequisite for having to hide your intelligence to make men look smarter or anyone else—what man worth his salt would want a good woman to hide her intelligence to make him look smarter—I fought a long, legal battle.

I learned from that battle that our country is the greatest Nation—something that I, of course, have always known. We do preach the rhetoric, as Pat Schroeder was talking about, about equality and family and justice. It is preached relentlessly by politicians.

But our country falls far short of that. However, it is the one Nation where we can really strive to make a difference. I think that the power structure throughout our history has been mostly white and male. Nothing wrong with being white and male. My father is one. I love him dearly. But I think that men are not about

to give women that equal share in the power structure without a good fight. And I say we ought to give them one. Thanks.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Ms. Craft.

Ms. McClendon.

Ms. MCCLENDON. Sir, it took me 27 years to get into the National Press Club, and 16 years later after that, we are still being treated down there sometimes as if we are not welcome. But now things are getting better.

But I want to say that while women were not in the Constitution—and you know, Abigail Adams wrote a letter to her husband when he was down there writing the Constitution saying, if you don't do something about women, for us, in that Constitution, some day we women are going to revolt. Well, he didn't. He ignored the letter, paid no attention to it. I think the letter is down here in the Smithsonian on the wall. Ms. Pat Nixon put that down there.

But I will say this for the Constitution. Women have always supported it, they have loved it, they have worked for it, they have done everything in the world they could, as they do for this country. And they have been darn good citizens, and they certainly should be treated as part of the team and not still be treated as second class citizens which they are.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Ms. McClendon.

Before I turn to the rest of the panel, I am going to take the liberty to say one more thing. I have always believed in the Constitution. I believe the Constitution is a near perfect document, but I have never believed our Government has been as perfect as the Constitution intended it to be.

I heard the other day on the floor, in a facetious way, in a joking way, one of the members of the Black Caucus explained that he wasn't going to Philadelphia because the Constitution didn't include him either. And if you think about it, a lot of women and minorities could make that claim.

I think they were always there, but it took the amendments and report language, I consider, to make sure that the people who were interpreting the Constitution understood that we were there. And we are still evolving.

You know, the first years of this Constitution there were really no free elections. And as we started the electorate process after 13 years, only landowners were given the right to vote. Somehow that was contrary to the belief of the Constitution, so we all got the right to vote. But did we all? There were minorities and blacks that did not get the right to vote, and neither did women. It wasn't until, I believe, 1924 that the women finally got the right to vote.

So we finally have evolved to a more perfect government that the Constitution talked about. I think we still have a long ways to go. There are still promises to be kept of that Constitution. We are working towards it.

But I would like to close and turn to the panel by saying to you, Ms. McClendon, if Pat Schroeder should decide not to run for President, would you run? I'll be your first supporter. [Laughter.]

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Gunderson.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I can't help but point out to you and this panel that sometimes actions speak louder than words. I want the panel to duly note when they leave this hearing room

today that it is the Republicans who have a female staff member on this staff committee, not the Democrats. [Applause.]

Ms. MCCLENDON. Sir, I guess you are aware of the fact that it was Republicans who were largely responsible for bringing about the Equal Rights Amendment. And yet, in 1980 they elected for the first time in over 40 years to leave it out of their platform when a certain man was running for President. But the Republicans have been friends of women all along.

Mr. GUNDERSON. That's music to my ears. I want you to know I have always been a supporter of the ERA.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Would you yield for one minute?

Mr. GUNDERSON. Well, 30 seconds.

Mr. MARTINEZ. I was thinking about that, that the only woman on this whole committee was a woman, and it was on that side. But I would ask, how many of the members on that side have as their staff director or AA a woman?

Mr. GUNDERSON. Well, the person who runs my Washington office and the person who runs my district office are both women.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Congratulations. But I asked how many. [Laughter.]

Mr. GUNDERSON. I am not the protector of my side any more than you are the protector of your side.

Mr. MARTINEZ. I would just like to say that my staff director and AA is a woman. Go ahead, Mr. Gunderson.

Mr. GUNDERSON. I can understand how you feel a little guilty about Eric. He's a good guy, but I couldn't resist the opportunity.

As I listen to both Ms. Craft and Ms. McClendon, I have to from a Republican perspective, ask the two of you, now don't you understand a little bit after reflecting on your testimonies why sometimes Republicans say the media is not totally objective? I mean, you both gave pretty strident testimonies here today. Don't you think there was a little bit of unobjectivity in that, in terms of reporting?

I mean, Ms. McClendon, you for example brought out this little old statistic about the President bringing in rich Republican women. You conveniently left out the statistic that the majority of women in this country voted for Ronald Reagan in 1984.

Ms. MCCLENDON. Well, I'll tell you why.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Okay.

Ms. MCCLENDON. I'll tell you one thing. I think it was 16 million women who were eligible to vote in 1980 who did not vote, and I am ashamed of that because we fought with great bitterness against the Democratic administration of Woodrow Wilson to get the right for women to vote. There were 16 million women did not vote. A lot of them did not vote in his 1984 election.

Had they voted, a lot of those women, they tell me they didn't vote because they were so poor that they didn't have the money to get to the bus to get to the ballot place. And a lot of them were so busy trying to raise money for their children and trying to make a living that they just didn't give any thought to politics. They thought they couldn't do anything about it anyway. They thought it wouldn't do any good for them to try.

Now, those are not partisan—those are facts. I just want both parties to work on it real hard to give women the freedom that they should have.

Mr. GUNDERSON. I admire you for that.

Ms. Craft, go ahead.

Ms. CRAFT. Also, when I mentioned the bit about well qualified women running for President, I think that there are. It is certainly a bipartisan question. There are well qualified women on both sides of the party question who could well run.

In terms of the question of reporter objectivity, I think it certainly is a great myth. My favorite reporters are not—the idea that you should not have a point of view, that you should be a mindless twit who just sort of looks things and gives an equal voice here and an equal voice there is silly. From a woman's perspective and a reporter's perspective, I can't help but notice when Governor Reagan was the governor of my State in California, in 1967 he signed the most liberal abortion funding bill in the Nation, one that provided the largest amounts for safe legal abortions for all women. He not only signed it, but issued a statement saying, I hope that my signing of this bill brings new compassion to a difficult problem.

As a reporter, as a woman, and not in any partisan sense, I want to know why he changed his mind. He certainly has every right to do that, but there are questions that you can't help but observe. I would say that the women who helped me get to my first trial, the Republican women of Santa Barbara County, the Democratic women, it wasn't a partisan question at all. It was one that all women understood, regardless of party.

Mr. GUNDERSON. I am going to ask you another question because it strikes a very sensitive nerve with me back home. I agreed with about 80 percent of your statement until you got to the point of suggesting that Mrs. North, somehow by virtue of a marriage and being a best friend, was also a buffoon.

Ms. CRAFT. No, no. I said she knew a buffoon when she saw one—her husband.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Well, it is suggesting the same thing. It disappoints me greatly that a person who has been as articulate and as aggressive in the cause of equal rights as you have in your own professional fights, would suggest that we ought to resort to calling either Mr. or Mrs. North a buffoon.

But you bring up a point that I want to call attention to. And that is, the one area where I think I have a dispute with some of the advocates in the ERA movement is when we get so aggressive in trying to achieve equal opportunity for women that in the process we somehow degrade those women who choose during the upbringing of their children, to stay at home.

My mother is a good example of that. And I will tell you one of the things the ERA movement has done to her is somehow make her feel like a second class citizen because she chose and was happy to be a housewife and a mother at that time. Since her children have grown, she has left the home.

But I think we have to be sensitive to that.

Ms. MCCLENDON. May I answer you on that?

Mr. GUNDERSON. Well, once Ms. Craft is completed.

Ms. CRAFT. My comments about Betsy North were that she had said—Colonel North with the oakleaf clusters. We do have a country, you know, that is totally in love with style as opposed to substance. It tends to block out a lot. I almost wore oakleaves today to increase my credibility, speaking from a reporter's perspective. She had said to him, "You silly buffoon. Why, that check from the contra funds, you spent that on leotards for our two daughters, you silly buffoon." I merely said she knew a buffoon when she saw one.

I was looking at those hearings from any politically aware woman's point of view, that there were no women there with speaking roles. There was clearly counsel there perhaps, but no one talked. There was no congressional examiner or inquisitor who was female. That was the point I was trying to make from the perspective of those images going out all over the country. The roles of women in this important national drama are reduced to the deferential secretary, the wife.

That's all fine, but what about the choice to have some of those other positions?

Mr. GUNDERSON. I will agree with the other——

Ms. CRAFT. We all know that Colonel North brought his wife and Mr. Poindexter brought the Episcopal minister wife with a large cross emblazoned as props. I don't think there is any question that that was very well thought out.

Go ahead, Sarah. I will defer.

Ms. MCCLENDON. I was just going to say, sir, that it wasn't ERA that made your mother or anyone feel downgraded as a housewife. It was the attitude of society in this country that has been going on for many generations. I will say that, as I always tell housewives, you are a secretary of transportation, you are head of the Department of Education, you are head of the budget in your household. You have all the sense of a general in logistics. You know how to get the show on the road and get the meal on the table at one time. And you are pretty good if you can do that, sir.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Thank you all very much.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Mr. Gunderson.

I am going to interrupt the panel. Do not leave, Ms. McClendon, unless you have to. We have two other panel members who might want to ask questions. But I want to interrupt at this time to bring on the Honorable Mary Rose Oakar to the front to give testimony.

There is a seat at the end here, Mary Rose. We would like to hear your testimony. We know you have a time problem, you have other bills that you are having hearings on. So we will go ahead and hear your testimony and then allow you to leave.

STATEMENT OF HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OHIO

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, and distinguished members of this panel and the panels coming after, thank you for the opportunity to let me testify.

I want to say to my good friend Mr. Gunderson, you and I have a lot in common, one of which is that my mother was a homemaker also, and she married my father in 1931. She gave up her job for buyer in Higbee's Department Store in Cleveland, Ohio and raised

five children, and was a very active member of her community and made a great contribution.

But if my mother were alive, I would really want the Equal Rights Amendment primarily for people like my mother. Because there is still discrimination, among other things, in the social security system, and not intentionally or maliciously, but in pensions. So that homemakers, for example, are not covered by disability and social security even though they pay all their credits. You can't get disability insurance if you are a homemaker in this country. One of the things that I think the Equal Rights Amendment would do is to put all these laws that we are trying to—all the legislation that I have introduced and my colleagues have introduced to correct some of these loopholes, it would just force us to put these pieces on the front burner and mandate that we do something about inequity.

So I really do think that there has been, not necessarily intentionally, but a lot of misrepresentation about what the Equal Rights Amendment would do.

But anyway, I want to thank you for having this hearing. I think it is so important that we talk about fairness and job opportunities for people who make up more than half the population. It is not just a women's issue, it is a family issue, because as you probably know or have heard, 26 million American women are part of a two-earner couple situation, 11 million women who are in the work force are head of their own households, heads of their households trying to raise their children. Seventy percent of the women in this country who are eligible through age were part or full time—lots of others would like to work—and they are in the work force for survival reasons.

One of the areas that I have focused on trying to get some reform in our Federal Government in the manner in which we treat Federal employees which I think would be a benchmark for what we ought to do with everyone in this country is fairness in pay, among other things, and some reforms in social security. The two are interrelated.

For women it is really a catch 22 situation. If you are not paid fairly when you are younger you get a double whammy when you are older because we really do still have to do some reforms in pension and social security. That is true for men who are in female dominated positions as well. And very often they happen to be minorities.

So what we found, for example, in the Federal Government was that out of an 18 rung classification system, in a study done for us by GAO, women and minorities are in the bottom five rungs of a classification system which has not been reformed since the Civil Service Act passed in 1923. At that time in our system we had less than five percent of the employees happened to be female or minorities. So it is time, I think, to take a look at that.

What do we mean when we talk about pay equity? I don't call it comparable worth any more because, as my friend Ms. Berry will tell you, being a member of the Civil Rights Commission, and I will let her speak about that if she likes, but they ill define comparable work. Basically what that commission said was that comparable worth was the gap between what a woman made and a man made, but they attributed it all to sex based wage discrimination.

Nobody says that the gap which is about 61 cents, some say 63 cents, I still think it is even lower than that, but nobody says that the 39 cents difference is due entirely to sex based wage discrimination. But what we do say is, if you look intrinsically at the job content and the work of that job, and you also look at the marketplace, if those things check out and there is still a big wage gap then there is nothing else left but discrimination.

So what do we mean by pay equity? That's why I call it pay equity because they ill-defined it, and then everything after that was based on that ill-defined definition, among other things. But in any event, to me, pay equity is equal pay for equal worth, equal pay for equal value. Value ought not to be left out.

Are the laws on the books? Sure they are. The Civil Rights Act, Title 7, the Equal Pay Act. So people can go to court if they have the wherewithal to do it, if they are paid unfairly and treated in a discriminated fashion. That to me is not the best way, it is not the accessible way for most people anyway who are underpaid.

The other way you can achieve fairness in pay, it seems to me, is to take a look at what it is like if you are able to, to join a union and deal with the issue in a collective bargaining way. The problem with that, even though I am an advocate of that, is that most people who happen to be female don't belong to unions and cannot collectively bargain.

As a result, and very often they are in small offices where they will lose a job if they even think of forming a union. On a Federal level we have not passed the Hatch Act, so that it is against the law really for people to attempt to collectively bargain or get involved politically in terms of our Federal employment unions with the exception of the postal workers and the letter carriers who can collectively bargain on certain elements. But as you know, the current situation is they are not allowed to strike. So that is inaccessible for most women.

So the most reasonable approach is to study the situation, as we tried to do with respect to the Federal Government and Federal employees, and if the studies show that there are some real gaps in wages such as the gap in white collar jobs, for example, the wage gap between the average woman who works for the Federal Government and the average man is $11,000 a year. I mean, they don't even start at $11,000, let alone have that gap.

So we did this study. We also find, it might interest this distinguished panel, you in particular, that Hispanic women made in the Federal Government an average of 50 cents for every dollar a man made, and black women made 56 cents for every dollar. Then we dealt with minority men, and it was very, very similar. So our study not only included—the study we would like to see adopted by Congress which has been adopted two sessions in a row in the House, not only included women, but minority men as well. We felt that was very important since they were at the bottom of the barrel in terms of wages as well.

It is a catch 22 for women in terms of poverty and the feminization of poverty. Because if you are paid unfairly, as I mentioned earlier, when you are younger, you get this double whammy when you are older. So we have this situation where the poorest person

in the country is a woman over 65, and the second poorest is that woman on welfare.

So we are really dealing with cross issues. That is why this is not an age issue. Younger women ought to be concerned about older women's plights, and families ought to be concerned about younger women's plights.

So what are we trying to do about it? Well, we passed this study, and hopefully, if you do a study as 46 States have done or are in the process of doing like my own State of Ohio, for example, did the study, they found that there are these gaps that they can't attribute anything other than this form of discrimination, and they are going to implement that study, and they are going to do it in phases. So it is not going to bankrupt my State.

You know what happens? The productivity and the morale of our people is tremendously increased when you pay people fairly. So I am hoping that we can pass our study for Federal employees which we have responsibility for, and then we can implement the study once it is done objectively and phase in fairness in terms of wages. It will not bankrupt the Federal Government whatsoever. It will assist that Government and its workers in doing a better job.

I would like to say just two quick things about social security and welfare reform. One cannot expect people who are heads of their households, male or female, in this case it happens to be mostly women, to get off welfare if you are not going to give them the means to do that. We have 36 million Americans without any health insurance. How can we expect a good decent mother to go off welfare when she is going to probably only be able to get, at least in the beginning, a minimum wage job? I think we ought to raise the minimum wage, by the way. We can't expect her to do that if we don't offer her some care for her children. No good mother will leave their kids at home alone, particularly young ones. And we can't expect that mother to get off welfare if she is going to lose her health insurance. What thinking person would do that?

We should also think in terms of job training and transportation. It is about time we addressed the issue comprehensively. I know this committee has a conscience and it will do this.

Just briefly about social security. We've got to do something about the five percent of the people in this country who have no pension. You know who they are. They are the domestics and the Federal employee spouses who have no access to—pretty much the women in this country who are not covered by any pension or insurance.

Now that is a crime to humanity that we in the western world do not have a pension for every American. That's number one.

Number two is, social security, and I am a great fan of social security, but it was signed into law in 1936 when the demographics of this country were very, very different. You only had 15 percent of the women in the work force. If a working spouse trying to assist with the family economics, if that woman works she is bound to get less than if she never worked at all. So working spouses are discriminated against in the system.

I already mentioned the problem that homemakers have. They are not covered under disability even if they paid all their credits.

Then if you are a divorcee, we used to say that you had to be married to somebody 20 years to plug in, now it is 10. What happens to the person who is married to somebody nine and a half years who is not going to have access to that Social Security pension? That's a problem.

Then we have displaced homemakers who are between 50 and 59 when most women are widowed or divorced, and they have no access to any kind of pension, and very seldom do they have access even today in terms of job training. Although I know that this committee has a conscience about that. We have to restore some of the things that we've lost.

So I guess what I am saying, for me anyway, the most liberating issue for Americans is economic security. If you are economically secure you can do anything you want, you know. You can go on and have true options. That's why fairness in pay, fairness in pensions, fairness in the manner in which people are treated and welfare reform are so important. We ought to have a conscience about it which this committee does.

I want to thank you for your past support of my legislation and for the outstanding work that this committee does. Thank you very much.

[Prepared statement of Hon. Mary Rose Oakar follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OHIO

Thank you Mr. Chairman, it is honor to testify before your committee today on an issue which I feel is necessary to ensuring the future economic security of women--Pay Equity. I commend Chairman Martinez and the rest of the committee members on their recognition of women as a permanent, expanding and vital sector of the American workforce. These hearings will provide a much needed forum on the problems women will be facing as they continue to juggle home, family and career.

Pay equity is a term that has been grossly misunderstood. It has been the subject of a great deal of misinformation, confusion, and distortion--some, unfortunately quite intentional. What I would like to do today is look beyond the rhetoric and politics surrounding Pay Equity and deal with the issue itself

What is pay equity? It is simply the elimination of sex-based wage discrimination. It is a process that should be conducted in a voluntary manner so as to avoid confrontation and controversy. This can be accomplished through fitting pay equity into the existing framework of each individual employer's compensation and classification systems. Pay equity is not the process of equalizing a rookie's pay with a superstar's wages; though that is what some major newspaper columnists will have you believe.

Pay equity is the process by which compensation experts within a corporation or the government, review wage and classification systems. That is what the movement is really all about. What has caused the demand for pay equity? I believe two factors have primarily created the groundswell of support. One is the tremendous change that has taken place over the last 25 years. Twenty-five years ago, women made up a very small portion of the full-time workforce. Today, women comprise over 40% of the workforce and for the first time, the white male worker is a minority in the American workforce. More than 51% of the workforce is composed of women and other minorities--that is tremendous change.

The second change is the rapid advancement in technology and its effect on the workplace. Today we are using technology on a daily basis that was not even available a few short years ago--much less commonplace! We now have computers and laser printers instead of typewriters and xerox machines. This new technology creates new demands on the workforce in terms of greater training, skills, effort and to some degree, greater responsibility. It is these catagories which are used to evaluate the worth of a job to the employer.

Many corporations and public sector employers have not kept pace with these technological advances and the effect these changes have on the type of skills necessary for their employees to adequately perform their jobs. They have not kept pace with the new technology in adapting their own classification and compensation programs to the realities of today's workplace. Unless the system is revised, it is obvious that the grim statistics that gave birth to the pay equity movement will continue to grow and flourish.

Women today constitute approximately 43% of the labor force with 11 million households dependent upon a single women for their financial existence. Another 26 million American households are dependent on two incomes--husband and wife--to make ends meet. Despite this growth in the number of working women and their importance to the economic well-being of so many, women continue to earn only 60% of male wages. The impact of that percentage is obvious when one looks at the effect on the approximately 23 million children dependent upon their mothers for financial support.

The United States has over half of its children relying upon their mothers for sustenance, yet these same women continue to receive two-thirds of what their male counterparts earn. The staggering reality of these figures is the most disheartening statistic of all--over one-fifth of this nation's children live in poverty and that figure will continue to rise unless a more equitable pay structure is installed.

In short, if we do not act quickly to ensure fair pay, the women and men who are paid unfairly, and the families who depend on them, will continue to suffer. It is incumbent on all of us to act swiftly to promote and protect fair pay. Our nation's economic security depends largely on our enactment of pay equity reforms.

A good place to start is our own federal government. The government employs almost 2 million civilian workers and 40% of those workers are women. Yet, it is not startling to discover that female federal workers are concentrated in the lowest eight grades and earn approximately $12,000 less than their male colleagues.

As an example to the nation, the Federal Government should review its own pay and classification systems to determine whether they are marred by discrimination. It is essential that the government set a standard to which the private sector aspire in the area of pay practices.

79-107 0 - 87 - 3

It is time to take a long and thorough look at why occupational segregation, wage gaps, and employment stratification exists. The point has been reached where a study is necessary to pinpoint where the problem is and why it exists. Does the problem lie in the lack of upward mobility or outdated classification and wage systems? Could basic sexual discrimination be the cause or the rapid movement of women in and out of the workforce? It is essential that these causes are investigated so that a workable solution can be found.

After the study is completed there will be specific answers upon which a foundation may be laid to determine which decisions with regard to classification and wage system modification should be made.

The issue of pay equity is making its third round through Congress. The 98th Congress approved legislation I introduced, H.R. 5680, The Federal Pay Equity and Management Improvement Act of 1984 by the overwhelming vote of 413 to 6. This bill mandated a study of the Federal pay and classification systems to determine whether they are effected by discrimination.

H.R. 5680 passed in the closing days of the 98th Congress directly preceding the election, taking its political opponents by surprise and accounting for the huge approval margin. It certainly shows the power women can have as a voting sector. Unfortunately, the House did not have sufficient time to gather the votes needed in the Senate and the bill died there.

Consequently, I returned in the 99th Congress with H.R. 3008, The Federal Equitable Pay Practices Act of 1985. This time my opponents were better prepared and lobbied strongly against passage. Nevertheless, the bill once again passed with a strong margin of 259-162 and unlike the previous effort, I believe the votes were there in the Senate. Time was our great enemy again and Congress adjourned before a floor vote could be taken due to stalling tactics by those opposed to pay equity.

I now look forward to the 100th Congress--a Congress which has a comfortable majority of pay equity proponents in both Houses. Of course pay equity's opponents are still there and I certainly do not underestimate that it will be a hard fight to obtain final passage of H.R. 387. H.R. 387 is part of the Economic Equity Act of 1987, which if passed in its entirety will provide the security women and other minorities need and deserve.

It is my conviction that pay equity will not just go away. If we remember the lessons of the past two congresses it is evident that pay equity is destined to became an economic reality. Pay equity is an integral part of the issue of economic security for women. Those employers who are

forward thinking and who wish to accommodate and yes, even embrace change are going to take the initiative as many states have done.

It is change that is forcing the issue of Pay equity. Not feminism or activism, but economic and social changes which are necessitating that we re-think the way people are paid. Change is always a very scary thing for most people and creates anxiety, stress and usually misinformation. We have a changing workforce and women are playing a vital and predominate role in these changes. It is absolutely necessary to the well-being of future generations that the classification and wage systems now employed are brought up to speed and reflect these changes.

Once again, I thank Chairman Martinez and the committee.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Mary Rose.

I am not going to ask you to stay for any questions because I know you have a time schedule problem. But I have three working daughters and two working daughters-in-law. I know their capabilities. And yet each of them have had their own struggle to overcome some of those prejudices and discriminations that have existed in the jobs that they have had to do, and had to prove themselves way beyond what a man would have to prove himself to be able to get any kind of a decent wage.

You hit the nail right on the head: The success of a democracy is education and economic security. And until we understand that we have to provide that for every one of our citizens, we are going to be denying what we started out to do in this Constitution, which was to create equality for all.

With that, I would like to ask the members, any one of them, if they do have some quick questions that they would like to ask of Mary Rose.

Major Owens.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I think the panel has been excellent and covered most of my questions.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you.

Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. HAWKINS. I have no questions.

Ms. OAKAR. I have to be on the floor.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you very much for appearing this morning before us.

Ms. OAKAR. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Thanks for having these hearings.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Then I would like to turn to the chairman of our full committee, Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. HAWKINS. I have just one or two questions, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

I think the witnesses have well documented the problem, and I think they have done it in an excellent fashion. The emphasis, it seems to me, that we would like to focus on is, however, the solution to the problem.

I was quite concerned when Ms. McClendon said that there were several responsibilities that had to be assumed at the Federal level because so much of what is wrong has been due to Federal policies.

In the report of the Women's Bureau that Ms. Dennis so ably gave us, I noted some rather distinct statements made. I cannot help but recall that the Women's Bureau in the Department of Labor perhaps is one of the exceptions to the rule. The point, it seems to me, that has to be made—I would like to get, first of all, Ms. Dennis's views on it, and I commend her for the support that she gave to affirmative action. Because her department, the Department of Labor happens to be one of the very few in the cabinet that has helped this committee in defending affirmative action.

However, I note, Ms. Dennis, on page 8 of your statement you indicated that developing innovative strategies to reconcile the conflicting needs of women, work and families is another challenge. And you identified various initiatives. However, then on a subsequent page you indicated initiatives such as these can come from local communities as well as from nonprofit organizations.

The question is, in what way has the Federal Government participated in drafting initiatives or strategies or even supporting legislation that would implement the excellent statements that are included in the report that you gave?

This committee, for example, has passed out a tremendous amount of legislation that would train and prepare women as well as others, for that matter, for the work force and provide civil rights for them. The Civil Rights Act originated in this committee. It is now being undermined by the Department of Justice, another agency of the administration. We have the Civil Rights Restoration Act to restore those rights to women in the field of education, for example, not supported by the administration unfortunately.

I don't think the Congress is doing nearly enough. I have been hearing these same statements made during 50 years of experience of my own in public life. But we are talking today about the same things we were talking about 50 years ago. We know that women are not equal in their opportunities and in their rights. And yet we have in this Congress pending legislation that will address those rights, and we have the administration on the other side not helping us to provide the resources to train anyone or to even educate the disadvantaged groups, including women.

Are there any Federal initiatives to back up the great and eloquent statements being made by the President over television which gives the impression that they support the equality of rights of all, including women. Yet, no initiatives that I know of I can identify. Can you cite for us any particular initiatives that you think the administration is launching or is supporting or would be willing to support in order to implement what we are really talking about?

Ms. DENNIS. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to respond to that question because I think it is an important one.

First of all, within the Labor Department, we are very pleased that we have sent to the Hill and received support from Congress thus far two pieces of legislation that can impact and be of assistance to women in the workplace. One of course is the dislocated workers bill, and our estimation is approximately one-third of the dislocated workers of America are female. So we are very concerned about that piece of legislation.

The other is the AFDC youth initiative which will be testified on by our Labor Department in August. We are anxious to see that piece of legislation go forward which allows for a year-round program for young people within welfare dependent families.

We also think that the administration's initiative as it relates to welfare reform is a critical one. I come from the State of Pennsylvania, and we were right out in front on welfare reform some five or six years ago in a very difficult time in our economy in Pennsylvania, but we believed that we had to go forward with welfare reform. So I am a proponent of the concept of giving States the flexibility to go forward with welfare reform. So we are anxious to see the initiatives that have been put forward considered in Congress on welfare reform.

I also think that the work that the Labor Department has been doing on Work Force 2000 is an important one. We convened a conference in March of this year which drew over 1,000 people from

around the country from some 45 States, and we discussed in detail the problems of work and family and the roles that corporations, unions, employees, government might take, or roles that they may play, and actions they might take. We were very pleased about that effort.

Subsequently, the Women's Bureau initiated a work-family expo within the Department of Labor. We developed that as a model to show that the government as an employer can be of assistance to its employees by offering them support services and information to help them balance work and family. We hope to have that model imitated by other Federal agencies.

I have talked with Director Horner about that particular initiative, and we hope to see some fine cooperation in other parts of the administration.

I think that so much of what has to be done in America requires a public-private partnership. It requires action by our social services structure, which is why in my testimony I commented on the role of nonprofit organizations.

I am also a former director of a United Way agency. I spent nine years in that system, and I know that there is change needed in the manner in which our social service system responds to families of today and working women of today.

So part of what we hope to advocate within the Women's Bureau is a need for our social service system also to be more flexible and to look to the future.

Mr. HAWKINS. I started out by commending the Bureau and the Department of Labor as being the exception to the rule. And I suspect your answer supports that contention because you indicated several initiatives that are not strictly from the Department of Labor, such as the welfare reform bill which the President threatens to veto. That is yet to be decided. So that may not be a good case to cite.

The displaced workers initiative is in the trade bill which, again, the President threatens to veto. So that may not prove to be a good case eventually.

But the overall position of the Department of Labor has been good. We have commended the secretary on this committee. But at the same time, the Department of Justice has proved to be a Department of Injustice as far as women and minorities are concerned. It is obviously opposing us in the restoration of the Civil Rights Act which is another wonderful opportunity they are missing in terms of such issues as child care which is before this committee. We have reported out a bill not supported by the administration. We are suggesting increasing the minimum wage. Certainly increasing the minimum wage is an issue that women are very much concerned about. The administration is opposing.

So I think when you look at the record if you judge them by what they are doing in terms of actual deeds, I don't think it is a very, very good time for women and minorities at this particular time. I would hope that through these hearings that the subcommittee is developing we can bring out the facts and we perhaps can get the public support to do what we think is badly needed.

But we are not doing it. The trend is not good. What little progress women have made has been lost, is being lost. We are not

moving in the proper direction. We obviously are not doing enough in Congress about it. The administration itself is doing much less. It just seems to me that this has to be decided in the election by the American public. I don't think it is a matter of a Republican or Democratic issue, whether or not we have female secretaries on our staff. I think it is a question of whether or not the 100th Congress is going to move in the proper direction to do something now in this Congress in order to establish a record of whether or not we are just talking and not doing anything about it.

Again, I want to end up on a positive note. I commend you and your bureau for doing an excellent job. Unfortunately, what you do is washed out otherwise by other departments.

Ms. DENNIS. If I may, Mr. Chairman, I would like to simply add that on the Civil Rights Restoration Act I think that we have an issue in which the Justice Department believes that the limitation ought to be to educational institutions. So I think that is more of a difference of opinion perhaps with some of your colleagues.

I think also on the welfare reform initiative the administration's point of view is more to giving flexibility to the States. So, again, I think that is more a question of a difference of opinion.

I think that we have to be very clear in America that people of good will can disagree. So I don't think it is quite fair necessarily to say that when there is disagreement between the administration and Congress that the administration is trying to roll back gains. I know that that is kind of a popular statement that is made often, but I am not sure that that does a service to the American people. I think that in this country people are free to disagree, and I think that people of good will disagree.

Mr. HAWKINS. Not on constitutional issues, Ms. Dennis.

Ms. DENNIS. I think that people who have goals that are similar very often disagree.

Mr. HAWKINS. We are not free to disagree on fundamental legal and constitutional principles. That is not controversial. Your reference to what the States should do, I am asking you what is it that we should do at the Federal level. We are not elected as State officials, we are elected as Federal officials.

When we put on the statute books a Civil Rights Act, for example, and then it is undercut and practically abolished by the administration, I don't see where that flexibility or that freedom is to be commended. I don't think that to refer to the States as giving the States more flexibility, that is not what we are elected to do. We are elected to protect at the Federal level the rights and privileges that the women are going to be testifying about today. If that isn't our role, then I think that the witnesses are going to be wasting their time talking to the wrong people. They should go to the States and plead for their equality at the State level.

But ERA is certainly not a State initiative. The Civil Rights Act is not a State initiative.

Ms. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, I was talking about the welfare reform proposal in which the administration is calling for an initiative which would give the States more flexibility. And they do operate the welfare program throughout this country. That is what I was talking about as it related to flexibility to the States.

It is the role of Congress to give them that flexibility because currently they do not have it based on Federal law.

Mr. HAWKINS. Poverty has been created—six million people have been added to poverty since this administration has been in power. And it has been due to Federal policies, not to State policies. It has been due to a restricted monetary and a backward fiscal policy. The budget cuts have come from this administration that have harmed a lot of Americans. If they are not willing to correct their own mistakes, I don't think that we should apologize for them.

I know my time is up, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the chairman, although as a woman I am inclined to want to have the last word, Mr. Chairman. I can't resist. I can't resist. So I would say to you that it is not a matter of apologizing. It is again what I said earlier, it is a matter of, in this country people of good will can disagree. I think we all want the same things. It is a question of how we go about it, under what circumstances, and what our approach is to solving problems. Thank you.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you. I want to thank the panel. We are going to have to move on.

Mr. Hayes.

Mr. HAYES. Just let me, for just one minute—I must say this. I am certainly not going to usurp any time because I recognize that witnesses here want to present their testimony who have not been heard from yet. And as a member of this committee I want to hear them, hear them out. We may very well be in session, Mr. Chairman. We may have to go register our presence around 12:00 when the bell rings, and some of us, including me, won't be able to get back.

But I do want to say for two reasons; one, I agree with what Ms. Craft says. I think we can understand that history has taught us, you don't relinquish power voluntarily. That's true even as we approach the legislative process with a body of lawmakers that are mostly male, white male. They know what power means. Your cure for what ails us, as you have mentioned, is going to come in eye dropper dosages unless you begin to put pressure on Congress and organize as you have done.

Ms. Dennis, I wish you would convey your feeling in regards to affirmative action to the director of the U.S. Dept. of Justice Civil Rights Division. He does not yet understand your position, let me assure you, because he has been here before.

Ms. McClendon, I want to say I appreciate your candor, your frankness with which you expressed yourself. Your testimony has been quite excellent, and I agree with it almost 99 percent, no question about it.

Ms. MCCLENDON. Thank you.

Mr. HAYES. But we have to get it out of this kind of hearing room into a place where other people might participate. If you run into Ms. Shaffley, you know, Phyllis, convey to her that the rights of women is something that she may concern herself with.

Thank you very much.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Mr. Hayes.

We will leave the record open so that any of the members who would like to in writing ask questions of the panel can. We would allow for that to be open so that they might respond.

Let me ask Mr. Owens——

Mr. OWENS. I have no questions, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank the panelists.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Mr. Owens.

Let me thank the panel for appearing. Let me explain to Ms. Dennis that the right of last word always remains with the chair. So I will take that prerogative and say that the chairman, the honorable chairman was referring to the fact that we have the right to disagree, but we do not have a right to violate the law of the land. And when the Supreme Court has ruled over and over again that affirmative actions are the law of the land, and the attorney general has consistently disagreed with that, it is his right to privately disagree with it, but as attorney general, it is his obligation to enforce the law which he seems unwilling to do.

In that regard, I would say that those people who are afraid of change will always focus on the negative, such as saying affirmative actions create reverse discrimination.

Mr. Gunderson, I wish he hadn't left, and I wish Mary would take this message back to him—there may be some women in the women's liberation movement who degrade a housewife, but they are in the minority and just a few have that simple opinion. The majority are working for us to recognize rights and the big contribution housewives make.

I have heard women from this movement over and over again say that. So if we are afraid of change and don't want to relinquish the power that Mr. Hayes talked about, then we focus on the negative and try to illustrate that as the majority thinking. It simply is not.

I want to thank the panel again.

With that, I would like to call the next panel. I am going to combine the last two panels for the sake of time and call up now Dr. Mary Frances Berry, Commissioner, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Ms. Sarah Crim, Staff Editor of the Bureau of National Affairs Special Projects Division, and William H. Wynn, International President of the United Food and Commercial Workers of the International Union, and Ms. Cynthia Marano, Executive Director, Wider Opportunities for Women.

Let me explain before Dr. Berry gets started that she has a time problem also. So we are going to allow her to give her testimony and then leave, and we will submit questions in writing to you and leave the record open so you may respond.

Dr. Berry.

STATEMENT OF MARY FRANCES BERRY, COMMISSIONER, U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Ms. BERRY. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

In addition to being a member of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, I am also the Geraldine R. Segal Professor of American Social Thought at the University of Pennsylvania.

I am pleased to respond to your invitation to testify before this committee, Mr. Chairman, because you and your colleagues have been in the forefront of legislative efforts to ensure equitable employment opportunities for all Americans.

I will simply summarize my testimony if it will be included in the record.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Yes. All testimony in its entirety will be included in the record, and we would appreciate summaries.

Ms. BERRY. But I won't again go into the discussion you have already had about the current status of increasing numbers of women in the labor force, and also about the fact that there is an increase in female head of households in the Nation at large.

But I will point out to you on that subject that in 1965 the percentage of families in the black community that were female headed was 21 percent. And at that time, Senator Patrick Moynihan, who was then an assistant secretary of labor, said that that meant there was a crisis in the black community. Today the female headed rate in the Nation at large is nearly 21 percent. And if by 1965 standards that was a crisis in the black community, I assume that means there is a crisis in the Nation at large that everyone has to deal with today.

We have heard how despite the equal opportunity laws that are on the books, some of which were passed with the direct support and instigation of members of this committee, that women are still in occupations traditionally dominated by females. And we have heard about the low wages. Congresswoman Mary Rose Oakar did point out in connection with her pay equity bill that the reason why she calls it pay equity instead of comparable worth is because the commission on which I sit decided to draft a definition of comparable worth that would make it seem ridiculous, including having the chairman call it the looniest idea since loony tunes before any investigation of the facts, and so that pay equity is a term that more clearly defines sex based wage discrimination about which she is concerned and which I am concerned because it does discriminate.

Pay equity is an issue, not just of sex, but it is also a race issue. That is clear.

In recent years as a result of some of these legal changes, and in particular affirmative action, which was part of the discussion here, women have increasingly been able to enter non-traditional jobs that pay higher wages. The recent Supreme Court decision in Johnson against Santa Clara Transportation Agency is one example of the use of affirmative action to move women into a job category from which they have been previously excluded.

There is all kinds of evidence that in fact women have benefited in terms of wages, higher wages and higher job categories. One scholar whose study I just finished reading points out that according to the 1980 Census analysis he did, four million women were employed in higher job categories than they could have had before the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was passed which resulted in a higher income of nearly $22 billion for them as a result of the employment and training programs as well as affirmative action.

We all know that despite these increases, there is this continuing problem of poverty.

Now let me move to what I think should be done; that is, what I think should be done about these issues. The chairman, Chairman Hawkins, has so eloquently in his questioning of Ms. Dennis pointed out the whole range of things that need to be done in the civil rights area.

I might point out that when he was discussing the Civil Rights Restoration Act and the opposition by the Justice Department, that this is not just a matter of difference of opinion. Perhaps Ms. Dennis, and I felt a little sorry for her, because she hasn't been here long enough to know, that this a struggle that goes way back before the Grove City decision in 1984, and that there has been consistent hostility on the part of the people in the Justice Department and the administration to enforcing Title 9 and the other civil rights laws in a broad way, and that each year they change their strategy on what the opposition is going to be and how it is going to be argued and articulated. But it isn't simply a matter of a difference of opinion. She probably doesn't know that, and it's not her fault.

In addition to worrying about the enforcement of the civil rights laws and trying to hold off the onslaught and worrying about whether we are going to have a Supreme Court Justice confirmed by the other body over there who will be somebody who will inhibit our efforts in this regard, there are other things that I think need to be done.

I am very worried about some of the current discussions of various welfare reform proposals that are before the Congress, and other training and education proposals. What am I worried about?

Everybody agrees that welfare needs to be reformed. Everybody now talks about jobs for the people who are on welfare. I am worried that jobs for the mothers who are involved must be provided at an adequate wage in order to move them beyond the poverty level. I think that is an appropriate worry because I have a suspicion that some people, not the members of this committee and clearly not the leadership on this issue over here in the House, that some people see welfare reform as simply a way of cutting the budget in the short run. Some people see welfare reform proposals as a way of arguing that everybody should be working and ignoring the dirty little secret which is that we have a six percent unemployment rate with about eight million people officially unemployed and that finding jobs for trainable welfare recipients will not be an easy task even if we come up with a welfare reform proposal.

This is going to require some money in the short run, and it is going to require upward mobility for these people. Also, if we are not careful, we will end up with a welfare reform proposal which will pretend that people can get jobs, and then we will cut the amount of benefits to them on the grounds that they are not working, and ignore something—and I am sorry too that Mr. Gunderson is not here, that in all his discussion about women staying at home with their children—ignoring in this whole discussion providing adequate resources for the mothers who will continue to stay at home with their children so that the children in those families will not be poor.

So I will be looking, and I know that members of this committee are working very hard to make sure that it is a fair proposal that will work. But we have to be careful not to make the situation worse.

The other thing is that everybody says that we need affordable day care. I don't know anybody in Washington now who says that day care is not necessary for the children of parents who work. Everybody says this, but we must avoid creating a situation in which black women and brown women are moved from welfare to day care employment where they care for their own and other people's children and receive poverty level wages while we pretend that we are providing them with adequate resources.

They must be paid enough, and they must be given upward mobility on a track, and we must not compound the problem by anything that we do.

The other thing is, we hear a lot about parental leave. And I am in favor of parental leave. I am in favor of the minimum wage. I am in favor of all the things I should be in favor of and am. There is a need for provisional parental leave.

However, we must recognize that unless and until we solve the problem of wage discrimination, sex based and race based, and provide higher wage jobs for women in two parent families, parental leave for the husband is an illusion. The husband will continue to work because his wages will be higher. It will be the women who will not work.

Also, in female headed households in which the mother is working and is a low paid worker, unpaid parental leave would be just another apparent option that she is supposed to have that will be foregone because she can't afford to take it. Such women are unlikely to have the savings or other resources to sustain themselves over a period of unpaid leave.

Now I think that a combination of enforcing the civil rights laws, enacting pay equity provisions in jobs not subject to collective bargaining where it exists on these subjects, and education and training proposals will improve opportunity for women in the workplace. These, along with resolving the day care dilemma, will help.

However, attending to the needs of the very poorest under employed and unemployed women will require structural changes in the economy. And Chairman Hawkins who is responsible for the Humphrey-Hawkins or Hawkins-Humphrey balanced growth bill, knows that better than anybody. And I know he knows that, and the members of the committee do, that we will require in order to attend to the needs of these people structural changes in the economy which requires first one thing: acknowledging that the economy needs to have structural changes made in it. That's the first thing that we need to do.

And I point that out because I noticed in recent discussions about the new head of the Federal Reserve Board, Mr. Greenspan, in his confirmation—I was in a meeting where a bunch of economists were saying, we want him to keep his eye on the apple—inflation, because unemployment is about where it should be. At the time they were talking it was 6.3, and black unemployment was twice as high, and Hispanic unemployment almost twice as high. They said, keep his eye on the apple in this room. And I looked around in the

room, and there was no one in the room who was unemployed, not a person.

So when we talk about structural changes in the economy, I know that this will not be easy. But there is the macro economic picture within which these changes to benefit women which is the subject today will have to take place.

So achieving a change in the environment in which right now full employment as a national policy goal is either ignored by a lot of people or wished away, defined out of any meaningful existence, will not make our task any easier.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

[Prepared statement of Mary Frances Berry follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF MARY FRANCES BERRY, COMMISSIONER, U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. Chairman:

I am pleased to respond to your invitation to testify before this committee on the subject of barriers confronting working women. You and your colleagues on this committee have been in the forefront of legislative efforts to ensure equitable employment opportunities for all Americans.

Today's subject is an extremely important one. Despite a legal structure that prohibits sex discrimination in the workplace, including the Equal Pay Act of 1963, Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, and Executive Order 11246, together with the various employment and training programs that exist under federal and state authority, women still face barriers to equal opportunity in employment. Women have difficulty balancing the various roles they are still essentially required to perform. They have problems acquiring and keeping jobs at adequate pay. They are too often faced with sex-based wage discrimination, and the sex segregation of jobs as barriers to employment opportunity.

We have moved far beyond the notion that women work only to acquire "pin money." Since the mid-1940's the labor participation rates of women have risen enormously. The U.S. Labor Department, Bureau of Labor Statistics reported that as of March, 1986, the labor participation rate for mothers who were either married (spouse present) or separated exceeded 60 percent and that for divorced mothers participation surpassed 80 percent. About 53 percent of never-married mothers were in the labor force, which probably reflects the fact that most are themselves young and they are caring for young children.

But increased labor force participation or employment has not meant enormous increases in family security. In general, women remain concentrated in the lowest paying jobs. Poor women especially have higher labor participation rates, but they have difficulty finding work, must work part-time, or hold jobs that do not pay a wage adequate to support themselves or a family. Some women who work live in shelters for the homeless because their earnings are not sufficient to enable them to rent habitation of their own.

In 1980, 23 million women were employed full-time of whom 3.2 million were heads of households. The poverty rate for these women was 5.4 percent, almost 2.5 times that of nuclear families. In 1965, the percentage of families in the black community that were female-headed was 21%, which then-Assistant Secretary of Labor, Patrick Moynihan referred to at that time as a national crisis. Today the female-headed rate in the nation at large is nearly 21%, which by the 1965 standards would signify a national crisis.

Despite equal opportunity laws, most women are still in occupations traditionally dominated by females. Although the jobs may not be low skill, they tend to be low wage and to have little promotion potential. Even in "female" professions, such as nursing, teaching, social work, and academic librarianship, men are represented disproportionately in the supervisory and higher paid positions. Some theorists allege that women choose to enter certain low wage occupations. But even if women did choose to enter certain occupations, they certainly did not choose to make less money. Assigning women to lower paying, sex segregated jobs is an unfair employer decision when thc jobs women hold often require the same amount of skill, effort and responsibilities as other, higher paid jobs.

In recent years, as a result of affirmative action requirements, women have increasingly been able to enter non-traditional jobs that pay higher wages. The Supreme Court decision in Johnson v. Santa Clara Transportation Agency is one example of the use of affirmative action to move a women into a job category from which women had previously been excluded. Alfred Blumrosen in an article, "The Legacy of Griggs: 'Subjective Judgments,' Affirmative Action, and Social Progress," noted that in 1980 alone, for example, four million women were employed in higher job categories than they could have held before 1965 at a resulting higher income of nearly 22 billion dollars. Equal opportunity laws, along with social progress that facilitated education and training in order to increase individual human capital, were in large measure responsible for these improvements.

Despite these improvements, the overall incidence of poverty among women workers makes other sources of income support absolutely essential. Private pension plans, annuities, Social Security payments, unemployment benefits, Workers' Compensation payments, and welfare payments are major components that must be assessed in determining the financial security of women.

5

In addition to enforcing the civil rights laws and attending to ways to end wage discrimination based on sex segregation of jobs, other measures are needed to eliminate barriers in the workplace. In current discussions of various welfare reform proposals, not only training and education, but jobs for the mothers targeted must be provided in order to move them beyond the poverty level. However, adequate resources must be provided for those mothers who continue to stay at home with their children. It is, after all, the children who are the objects of the proposals. Welfare reform must not be seen solely as a way of cutting budgets in the short run. It must be understood that with a 6% unemployment rate and about 8 million people officially unemployed, finding jobs for trainable welfare recipients will not be an easy task.

Furthermore, affordable day care must be provided for the children of parents who work. However, we must avoid creating a situation in which black and brown women are moved from welfare to day care employment where they care for their own and others' children and receive poverty level wages, while we pretend that we are providing them with adequate resources.

There is also a need for the provision of parental leave at the time of birth, illness, or other crisis times in the lives of children. However, we must recognize that unless and until we provide higher wage jobs for women in two-parent families, parental leave for the husband is an illusion. He is more likely to continue working because his wages are higher. Furthermore, for female-headed households in which the mother is a low paid worker, unpaid parental leave would be another apparent option that must be foregone. Such women are unlikely to have the savings or other resources to sustain themselves over a period of unpaid leave.

A combination of enforcement of federal civil rights laws, enactment of pay equity provisions at the state and federal levels in jobs not subject to collective bargaining, and education and training schemes would improve opportunity for women in the workplace. These, along with resolving the day care dilemma, would help. However, attending to the needs of the very poorest, underemployed and unemployed women will require structural changes in the economy which would require first the acknowledgment of a need for improvement in our current economic system.

Achieving such change in an environment in which full employment as a national policy goal is either ignored or defined out of any meaningful existence will not be easy.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Dr. Berry, for a succinct delivered testimony that tells a lot in a brief message. Thank you.

Ms. Crim.

STATEMENT OF SARAH K. CRIM, STAFF, SPECIAL PROJECTS DIVISION, THE BUREAU OF NATIONAL AFFAIRS, INC. ACCOMPANIED BY, PATRICIA LOGAN, STAFF EDITOR, OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REPORTER

Ms. CRIM. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee.

My name is Sarah Crim. I am a staff editor in the Conferences and Special Projects Division of the Bureau of National Affairs, Inc. Accompanying me is Patricia Logan, staff editor on BNA's Occupational Safety and Health Reporter.

BNA is a private information company here in Washington with more than 70 information services, reporting on business, labor, legal, environmental, financial, taxation and other public policy issues.

Today, BNA is releasing a comprehensive special report titled, "Pregnancy and Employment: The Complete Handbook on Discrimination, Maternity Leave, and Health and Safety." We are honored to have the opportunity to make the report public at this subcommittee hearing.

The report addresses several major issues affecting pregnant workers and their employers, including discrimination, maternity leave, reproductive hazards, and career ramifications.

Corporations are in a transition period regarding pregnant workers. Until recently, there simply were not that many pregnant workers at the workplace. In the 1950's when 75 percent of American households consisted of a father who worked and a mother who stayed home with the children, women worked when they were single or until, but usually not after, they had children. Women who climbed the corporate ladder were said to be married to their jobs and often did not marry.

Our report notes that there are about 33 million working women in America who are of childbearing age, and at least 75 percent of these women become pregnant at some time during their careers.

According to BNA research and interviews with corporate officials we assembled for our report, pregnant women in the work force face numerous barriers, including these.

Despite antidiscrimination laws, some women get fired or passed over for promotions because they are pregnant. Women are excluded from certain jobs that involve interaction with chemical substances that may harm pregnant women or their reproductive systems. Experts interviewed for the report claimed that these same substances may have adverse effects on the male reproductive system, but men are not excluded from the workplace in this manner.

New emergency technology such as semiconductor manufacturing and video display terminal work where most of the workers are women also are of concern in the area of reproductive hazards.

Employers sometimes use a pregnancy or a request for maternity leave as a performance appraisal tool, a way to get rid of a less than ideal employee.

Some employers still are reluctant to promote women into high powered jobs that require overtime and time spent away from family duties.

Even pregnancy itself can have a negative effect. According to some experts, the view still persists among some employers that pregnant women should not be put under undue stress, inherent in jobs of authority and responsibility. And there continues to be a fear among employers that once a woman has a baby, she will not return to her job.

Today, increasing numbers of employers are facing up to the need to provide some kind of maternity leave protections for pregnant workers. However, even among companies that are trying to deal with pregnant worker issues, not all pregnant employees are treated alike.

For example, experts told us that professional or managerial women often feel a subtle pressure while on maternity leave to keep informed about what is going on at the office, to take work home, and to return to work quickly. Yet paradoxically, our interviews indicate that it is these women who often are able to negotiate a better maternity leave than lower ranking women.

Nonprofessional women, on the other hand, often are required to be back on the job in a short period of time, sometimes two weeks or less. If the women do not come back this quickly, they lose their job, their seniority, or both.

If we have the time, I would like to cite a few examples from our report that illustrate these points. At a law firm in Boston featured in the report, the attorneys, about half of whom are women of childbearing age, are given a more generous child care leave package than are the support staff, a policy that apparently is not uncommon among law firms across the country. Yet, a partner with the law firm noted that several of the women partners postponed having children until they had achieved partner status in the firm and their careers were secure.

An occupational health nurse at the Quaker Oats Company's corporate headquarters in Chicago told BNA that most pregnant workers take only four to six weeks off when they have a child, in keeping with the company policy that provides only short term disability leave. She said, this is a short amount of time, but added that the workers, "just deal with it." If 18 weeks mandatory parental leave were required by Federal law, she saw it as being a hardship for the company in some instances, particularly she said, "in replacing managerial employees."

But officials at Levi Strauss & Company, Corning Glass Works, which respectively provide five months and six months child care leave, said that while managers sometimes find these policies inconvenient, the companies feel that on the whole they work well.

Several corporate officials interviewed by BNA predicted that if the Family and Medical Leave Act becomes law, companies will be reluctant to hire women of childbearing age because they will not want to put up with the workplace disruptions that might occur

when such a woman would take 18 weeks of unpaid leave to care for her newborn child.

Increasingly, however, pregnant employees are not merely accepting whatever their employers give them. We found that in the area of pregnancy discrimination, women are filing more and more lawsuits pertaining to pregnant worker issues. These range from cases involving morality issues in which unmarried pregnant women teachers or youth counselors are fired for setting a negative example, to cases where women are fired or demoted almost immediately after their supervisor learns of their pregnancy.

I would like to emphasize that the barriers I have mentioned in this testimony are not faced by pregnant workers at all public and private sector employers. Some employers in some states are more active than others in dealing with pregnant workers concerns. Five states just this year that pass laws that require employers to provide some form of mandatory parental leave.

The subcommittee has been given a chart prepared by BNA that details State laws, regulations, and proposed legislation affecting pregnant workers.

We value the opportunity to appear here today. BNA considers pregnancy in employment to be a very important employee relations issue.

At this time we would like to submit the highlights of our report and the chart on State laws, regulations and bills for the record. Ms. Logan, who wrote the report's chapter on reproductive hazards, and I will be happy to answer any questions you might have about the report.

Thank you.

[Prepared statement of Sarah Crim follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SARAH CRIM, STAFF EDITOR, THE BUREAU OF NATIONAL AFFAIRS, INC.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the committee.

My name is Sarah Crim, and I am a staff editor in the Conferences and Special Projects Division of The Bureau of National Affairs, Inc. Accompanying me is Patricia Logan, staff editor on BNA's Occupational Safety and Health Reporter.

BNA is a private, employee-owned information company in Washington, D.C. BNA is the largest, non-government provider of information services in the nation's capital, with more than 70 information services reporting on business, labor, legal, environmental, financial, taxation and other public policy issues.

Today, BNA is releasing a comprehensive special report on pregnancy and employment, titled Pregnancy and Employment: The Complete Handbook on Discrimination, Maternity Leave, and Health and Safety. We are honored to have the opportunity to make the study public at your subcommittee hearing.

The report addresses several major issues affecting pregnant workers and their employers, including discrimination, maternity leave, reproductive hazards, and career ramifications.

Corporations are in a transition period regarding pregnant workers. Until recently, there simply were not that many pregnant workers to contend with at the workplace. In the 1950s, when 75 percent of American households consisted of a father who worked and a mother who stayed home with the children, women worked when they were single or until -- but not after -- they had children. Women who climbed the corporate ladder were said to be "married to their jobs" and often did not marry.

The large influx of women of childbearing age into the workforce -- due to economic necessity and changes brought about by the women's liberation movement of the late 1960s and early 1970s -- is really a recent phenomenon to which some businesses have not yet fully adjusted.

Our report notes that there are about 33 million working women in America today who are of childbearing age -- and at least 75 percent of these women will become pregnant at some time during their careers.

These numbers signify that a dramatic change has taken place over the past 20 years in the American workplace. As recently as 1975, only 30.8 percent of married women with children one year or younger were in the workforce, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Today, says BLS, almost half (49.8 percent) of these women work.

It was not that long ago that the American Medical Association recommended that women quit work in their sixth month of pregnancy. Yet, according to the Department of Health and Human Services' National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS), in 1980, 41 percent of pregnant women in white-collar jobs worked in their ninth month of pregnancy.

According to BNA research and interviews with corporate officials we assembled for the report, pregnant women in the workforce face several barriers.

Let me emphasize that these barriers are not faced by pregnant workers at all public and private sector employers. Some employers and some states are more activist than others in dealing with pregnant workers' concerns. For example, just this year, five states have passed laws that require employers to provide some form of mandatory parental leave. The subcommittee has been given a chart prepared by BNA that details state laws, regulations, and proposed legislation affecting pregnant workers.

At this point, however, I would like to delineate some of the barriers faced by pregnant women, as discussed in the BNA special report:

--Despite anti-discrimination laws, some women have been fired or passed over for promotions because they got pregnant.

--Women are being excluded from certain jobs that involve interaction with chemical substances that may harm pregnant women or their reproductive systems. Experts interviewed for the report claimed that these same substances may have adverse effects on the male reproductive system, but men are not excluded from the workplace in this manner.

--Employers sometimes use a pregnancy or a request for maternity leave as what several experts termed a "performance appraisal tool," a way to get rid of a less than exemplary employee. This is particularly the case in companies that have no formal maternity leave policy.

--Taking a long maternity leave can itself engender negative feelings among co-workers and superiors.

--Some employers still are reluctant to promote women into high-powered jobs that require overtime and time spent away from family duties, since women still bear the major responsibilities of child-drearing.

--Even the temporary condition of pregnancy itself can have a negative effect. According to some experts, the view still persists among some employers that pregnant women should not be put under undue stress, inherent in jobs of authority and responsibility. Experts also said that there continues to be a fear among employers that once a woman becomes pregnant, she will not return to her job.

--Professional or managerial women often feel a subtle pressure to minimize the effects of having a child by keeping informed about what is going on at the office, taking work home, or even delaying childbirth until a career is well-established.

--Non-professional women often work for employers who expect them to be back on the job in a short period of time, sometimes two weeks or less. If the women do not come back this quickly, they lose their job, their seniority or both.

Let me now cite some specific examples that appear in our handbook on pregnancy and employment.

The Quaker Oats Company's corporate headquarters in Chicago employs 1900 persons, about half of whom are women with white-collar jobs. Quaker Oats has a disability leave policy for its pregnant employees; according to an occupational health nurse for the company, most pregnant workers take only four to six weeks off when they have a child. She said this is a short amount of time, but added that the workers "just deal with it." She added that if HR 925 were to be enacted, it would be "highly impractical" for the company. She said that it might be relatively easy to replace a clerical employee for 18 weeks, "but you're not going to replace a manager" as easily, because the position could not be left blank, and "that could be rough."

By contrast, Levi Strauss & Co. provides a total of five months leave -- paid disability plus unpaid child care leave -- for its employees. A personnel executive with Levi Strauss told BNA that while it is "a hardship sometimes" to have an employee gone for five months, "you make do." He added, however, that while managers do not appear to resent the employee's taking disability leave, some managers do resent the child care leave. The way he described this attitude was, "Why can't I fill the job? She's gone so long."

Several corporate officials interviewed by BNA predicted that if the Family and Medical Leave Act becomes law, companies will be reluctant to hire women of childbearing age, because they will not want to put up with the workplace disruptions that might occur when such a woman would take 18 weeks of unpaid leave to care for her newborn child.

There are other effects connected with the issue of maternity leave.

For example, our interviews indicate that managerial and professional women often are able to negotiate a better "deal" for themselves when they have a baby. By the same token, it is these women who appear to feel the pressure to return to work as soon as possible because they are needed.

For example, at a law firm in Boston, the attorneys -- about half of whom are women of childbearing age -- are given a more generous child care leave package than are the support staff, a policy that apparently is not uncommon among law firms. But according to one partner at the firm, many of these women postpone having children until after they have achieved partner status within the firm and their careers are secure.

Bank Street College of Education in New York City, a 70-year-old institution of higher learning that specializes in research and education on children and the balancing of work and family concerns, gives its employees three months of paid child care leave. Since January 1, 1986, the policy has applied to all of the college's workers, but previously it applied only to professional staff. Interestingly, a personnel official at Bank Street told BNA that often professional staff -- particularly faculty -- do not take their three months all at once, because they feel a responsibility to be at their jobs.

Experts on work and family issues from such organizations as Catalyst and The Conference Board, whom we interviewed for the report, claimed that often professional women feel a "subtle pressure" to get back to work as soon as possible.

An official of the research organization Catalyst, which conducted a survey on corporate parental leave policies, said that in her view, many employers still view maternity leave as being "a hassle." She claimed that there is a "myth" that women do not return to the workplace when they become pregnant. Among the eight companies profiled in the maternity leave section of the report, the return rate for pregnant workers was estimated as being from 75 percent to 95 percent. This included companies that offered relatively short disability leaves, as well as employers that offered longer-term child care leaves.

Interestingly, at the Boston law firm where pregnant attorneys got a more generous child care leave package than did support staff, nearly all the attorneys returned to work, but the support staff tended not to come back. It is not clear whether this is because the attorneys are more committed to their careers than the support staff, or because there is a shortage of legal secretaries in the Boston area, and the secretaries take a longer leave than they are allowed to be home with their babies, and then get a job with another law firm when they are ready to return to work.

The area of reproductive hazards also has generated concern in terms of barriers that exist for pregnant workers. There are newly

emerging technologies -- such as semiconductor manufacturing and Video Display Terminal work -- where a large proportion of the workers are women. Following the release last year of a Digital Equipment Corp. study that showed a cluster of miscarriages among semiconductor workers, a number of semiconductor manufacturers pulled their pregnant workers off the line. This action generated some protests among affected unions, who claimed that companies should remove the hazards, not shut the women out of work.

Although there has been little scientific charting of adverse reproductive effects, some companies, such as American Cyanamid Company, have taken actions that require women of childbearing age to be sterilized before they are allowed to work with certain substances.

Women's organizations pointed out to us that they do not know of instances where men have been treated similarly, even though, according to scientific experts we interviewed, a substance that is hazardous to the female reproductive system is likely to be hazardous to the male reproductive system as well.

In the area of pregnancy discrimination, women are filing more and more lawsuits pertaining to pregnant worker issues.

These range from cases involving "morality" issues, in which unmarried pregnant women employed by organizations whose purpose is to teach or counsel young people are fired for setting a negative example, to cases where women are fired or demoted almost immediately after their supervisor learned of their pregnancies.

The barriers to advancement a pregnant woman faces often may be subtle, as in the pressures to return to work enumerated above.

Just the very fact that women have the potential of becoming pregnant can work against their advancement in a company, according to experts.

Two psychologists, writing in a recent issue of Personnel magazine, noted that "some managers are concerned that pregnant workers are psychologically unstable," even though, they said, "the reverse is true. Pregnant women show reduced levels of tension and may be among a manager's more stable employees."

We value our opportunity to appear before the committee today. BNA considers pregnancy and employment to be one of the most important employee relations issues in the workplace today.

Ms. Logan, who wrote the report's chapter on reproductive hazards, and I will be happy to answer any questions you might have about the report.

Thank you.

PREGNANCY AND EMPLOYMENT:

The Complete Handbook on Discrimination, Maternity Leave and Health and Safety

The attached chart, produced by The Bureau of National Affairs, Inc., includes a breakdown of states that have laws, regulations, or proposed legislation on parental/maternity leave, discrimination and reproductive hazards.

According to the data compiled by BNA:

- 5 states enacted parental/maternity leave laws in 1987.
- 15 states have enacted parental/maternity leave laws as of 7/21/87.
- 3 states have enacted discrimination laws or regulations as of 7/21/87.
- 3 states have enacted laws on reproductive hazards as of 7/21/87.
- 19 states have considered legislation in 1987.

State Pregnancy Laws, Regulations, and Bills

States	Disability/Maternity Or Parental Leave	Discrimination	Reproductive Hazards	Proposed Legislation In 1987
Alabama				
Alaska				X
Arizona				X
Arkansas				
California	X	X	X	
Colorado	X			X
Connecticut	X	X	X	
Delaware				X
Florida				X
Georgia				X
Hawaii	X			
Idaho				
Illinois	X			X
Indiana				
Iowa	X	X		
Kansas	X			
Kentucky				
Louisiana				
Maine				
Maryland				X
Massachusetts	X			X
Michigan				
Minnesota	X			
Mississippi				
Missouri				X

Source: The Bureau of National Affairs, Inc.
© 1987

State Pregnancy Laws, Regulations, and Bills (Cont'd)

States	Disability/Maternity Or Parental Leave	Discrimination	Reproductive Hazards	Proposed Legislation In 1987
Montana	X			
Nebraska				
Nevada				
New Hampshire	X			
New Jersey				X
New Mexico				
New York				X
North Carolina				
North Dakota				
Ohio				X
Oklahoma				X
Oregon	X			
Pennsylvania				X
Rhode Island	X			
South Carolina				X
South Dakota				
Tennessee	X			
Texas				
Utah				
Vermont				X
Virginia				X
Washington	X		X	
West Virginia				
Wisconsin				X
Wyoming				

Source: The Bureau of National Affairs, Inc.
© 1987

Mr. MARTINEZ. If there is no objection, those materials will be entered into the record.

Mr. Wynn.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM H. WYNN, INTERNATIONAL PRESIDENT, UNITED FOOD AND COMMERCIAL WORKERS INTERNATIONAL UNION ACCOMPANIED BY, PAT SCARCELLI, VICE PRESIDENT AND DIRECTOR OF WOMEN'S AFFAIRS

Mr. WYNN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My name is William Wynn, and I am President of the United Food and Commercial Workers International Union, AFL-CIO. With me today is Pat Scarcelli, Vice President and Director of Women's Affairs.

UFCW has 1.3 million members organized in 700 local unions throughout the United States and Canada. The UFCW and its local unions have contracts with thousands of employers in retail, health care, insurance, finance, food processing, meat packing, fur, and leather, and other industries.

The UFCS's membership mirrors the entire U.S. working population in terms of age, sex, education, income and geographical distribution.

Women make up about one-half of our membership. Recent poll and demographic data suggest that within the next several years women may comprise a majority of our membership.

About half of our women members are over age 35. Almost 60 percent work less than 32 hours per week. About 25 percent of UFCW women are principal wage earners. Another 10 percent classify themselves as co-equal wage earners.

Union contracts are an important vehicle for helping working women achieve equality in the workplace. Unions have been leaders in ensuring that women receive equal pay for equal work.

The UFCW has made substantial progress in eliminating the much-publicized male-female wage gap for our members. Hourly wages for women UFCW members average 87.6 percent of the rate for men—considerably better than the national average of 64 percent.

Moreover, we in the UFCW expect this comparatively small wage gap to disappear soon. Because UFCW contracts tie wage rates to seniority, not gender, as women gain seniority, their wage rates will rise accordingly.

In addition, virtually all of our women members enjoy through their contract benefits such as health and welfare, pension, and other benefits available on a gender-blind basis.

Most women work for economic reasons. Seventy-five percent of all working women are still employed in the service sector industries. These traditional service jobs generally have two characteristics in common—low wages and non-traditional working hours.

Wages for service employees are among the lowest of all industries. The average income for retail and service workers in 1986 was only $11,000 per year. For women, reliance on these jobs means that they will stay at the bottom of the economic ladder.

Perhaps a more dangerous aspect of the service sector industries is the trend toward more part time and temporary positions.

Women are hardest hit by the switch to part time and temporary employment.

Let me give you an example of what I mean. In northern California, an affirmative action program was established by the UFCW and Safeway Stores, Inc., to eliminate discrimination in promotional opportunities for women and minorities. The program was designed to move women and minorities into management positions in the retail food stores. The Safeway Management Trainee Program, however, was limited to full time employees.

The company had a difficult time meeting the goals of the plan because most women employees worked part time schedules due to their low seniority, child care obligations and other traditional family obligations which limit the number of hours women can work.

Another critical problem that faces working families is the availability of quality, affordable child and dependent care.

Some of our local unions are acting to address our members' critical child care needs. As an example, our local union in Denver, Colorado can now put their children into a UFCW sponsored day care center.

Many working parents, particularly retail workers, have unpredictable schedules, and the center is designed to address their needs. It is open from 6 a.m. to 11 p.m., six days a week, and has a capacity of 88 children. Programs are tailored for children between two and ten years of age, and include reading readiness and computer training. The center provides meals to children and is fully licensed and regulated by the State of Colorado. The cost of $42.50 per week.

Other UFCW locals are bringing child and dependent care to the bargaining table. Our local union in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, for example, recently negotiated with their employers a $15 per member per month contribution to a joint labor-management retail food fund which will administer a day care service program.

Our Nation must recognize that women are in the workforce to stay, and must act now to address the growing child care crisis.

Two other serious problems that women in service industries face are the lack of basic health insurance and pension coverage.

Employers who have benefit plans should be required to extend them to part time employees on a pro-rated basis. This would allow all employees of covered employers to participate in the health and pension plans.

Also, a mechanism for pension portability should be established to ensure that workers who change jobs receive the pension rights to which they are entitled.

The late President John Kennedy once said, "A rising tide lifts all boats." There are, we believe, a number of legislative proposals that will create a rising tide that would greatly improve the economic status of all workers, and especially women workers.

Among these proposals is legislation to protect all workers' jobs in leveraged buyouts, sales of assets and corporate merger situations. Women often bear a disproportionate share of the economic dislocation that results from "merger mania."

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, winning better conditions for all our members, women as well as men, is obviously our top priority.

The UFCW and its local unions have made great strides in ending pay differentials and inequities in hours and benefits. We view this not only as a fight at the bargaining table, but also a fight here in Congress.

We appreciate the opportunity to appear today and look forward to working with the Congress, this committee, and the administration to meet and deal with these real life concerns of working women.

Thank you.

[Prepared statement of William H. Wynn follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF WILLIAM H. WYNN, INTERNATIONAL PRESIDENT, UNITED FOOD AND COMMERCIAL WORKERS INTERNATIONAL UNION

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee. I am pleased to testify today on some of the problems working women are facing. My name is William H. Wynn, and I am the International President of the United Food and Commercial Workers International Union (AFL-CIO).

The UFCW has 1.3 million members organized in 700 local unions throughout the United States and Canada. The UFCW and its local unions have contracts with thousands of employers in retail, health care, insurance, finance, food processing, meat packing, fur, leather, and other industries.

The UFCW's membership mirrors the entire U.S. working population in terms of age, sex, education, income and geographical distribution.

Women make up about one-half of our membership. Recent poll and demographic data suggest that within the next several years women may comprise a majority of UFCW members.

William H. Wynn
International
President

Jerry Menapace
International
Secretary-Treasurer

United Food & Commercial Workers
International Union, AFL-CIO & CLC
1775 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 223-3111

79-107 0 - 87 - 4

About half of our women members are over age 35, and half are under 35. Almost 60 percent work less than 32 hours per week. About 25 percent of UFCW women are principal wage earners. Another 10 percent classify themselves as co-equal wage earners.

Union contracts are an important vehicle for helping working women achieve equality in the workplace. Unions have been leaders in ensuring that women receive equal pay for equal work.

The UFCW has made substantial progress in eliminating the much-publicized male-female wage gap for our members. Hourly wages for women UFCW members average 87.6 percent of the rate for men -- considerably better than the national average of 64 percent.

Moreover, we in the UFCW expect this comparatively small wage gap to disappear soon. Because UFCW contracts tie wage rates to seniority, not gender, as women gain seniority, their wage rates will rise accordingly.

In addition, virtually all of our women members enjoy through their contracts benefits such as health and welfare, pensions, and other services available on a gender-blind basis.

The service sector is the most rapidly growing sector of the U.S. economy. Forty-six percent of all jobs and three out of four new jobs created are in the service sector. The vast majority of these new service sector jobs are characterized by low pay and part-time hours. An increasing number are also temporary positions. As the service sector becomes a larger factor in our economy, special attention must be paid to the needs and problems of individuals who work in these industries.

Most women work for economic reasons. Any analysis of the problems of working women requires a thorough examination of the content and quality of service jobs. Single mothers work to support their children. Forty-one percent of married working women have husbands who earn less than $15,000 per year, making two paychecks crucial to family income. While some women have begun to enter non-traditional occupations, 75 percent of all working women are still employed in service sector industries -- retail and wholesale trade, finance, insurance, personal services, health care, and education. These traditional service jobs generally have two characteristics in common -- low wages and non-traditional working hours.

Wages for service employees are among the lowest of all industries. The average income for retail and service workers in 1986 was only $11,754 per year. For women, reliance on these jobs means that they will stay at the bottom of the economic ladder.

Perhaps a more dangerous aspect of service sector industries is the trend toward more part-time and temporary positions, the so-called "marginal" or "contingent" jobs. Fewer full-time jobs, and which frequently offer better pay, basic health benefits and pensions, are now being created. Employers would rather offer part-time and temporary positions to avoid having to provide benefits for their workers. Wages for these marginal jobs are often 40% to 50% lower than wages for comparable full-time positions. This trend towards "marginalization" of jobs is rapidly resulting in a two-tiered economic system where a few select employees are awarded full-time status, while most are forced into part-time or temporary positions.

Women are hardest hit by the switch to part-time and temporary employment. In fact, women make up 78 percent of all part-time employees and 67 percent of all temporary employees. Often they end up trapped in dead-end jobs, with little opportunity for economic and professional advancement. Let me give you an example of what I mean.

In Northern California, an affirmative action program was established by the UFCW and Safeway Stores Inc. to eliminate discrimination in promotional opportunities for women and minorities. The program was designed to move women and minorities into management positions in the retail food stores. The Safeway Management Trainee Program, however, was limited to full-time employees.

The company had a difficult time meeting the goals of the plan because most women employees worked part-time schedules due to their low seniority, child care obligations and other traditional family obligations which limit the number of hours women can work.

Another critical problem that faces working families is the availability of quality, affordable child and dependent care. The need for child care has increased dramatically in recent years as women have entered the workforce in record numbers. Almost one-half of the children under age 13 care for themselves when they are not in school. Many service sector workers have special difficulty coping with child care arrangements because of part-time or temporary jobs, late hours and unscheduled call-ins.

Current levels of direct and indirect support for child and dependent care services are wholly inadequate to meet this increasing need. Major funding sources for full-day care of preschool children include Federal programs for child care for low-income families, food subsidies for child care centers, and income tax deductions allowed to working parents for child care expenses. Since 1980, however, federal subsidies for child care for low-income families and food subsidies for child care centers has decreased. We wholeheartedly support full funding those Federal programs to assist low-income families with their day care problems. Attention also must be directed to a much larger group of workers above the poverty line -- middle income workers, many of them UFCW members, who cannot find affordable, quality child care. Many of our members cannot afford licensed day care centers, even when they can find them. They leave their children with their grandparents or other relatives, a neighbor, or worse yet, they are left unattended.

Some of our local unions are acting to address our members' critical child care needs. UFCW Local 7 members in Grand Junction, Colorado, can now put their children in a UFCW sponsored day care center. The center is designed to meet the special needs of parents who do not work 9 to 5 shifts. Many working parents, particularly retail food workers, have late-night and unpredictable schedules, and the center is designed to address their needs. It is open from 6:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m., six days a week and has a capacity of 80 children. Programs are tailored for children between two and 10 years of age, and include reading readiness and computer training. The center provides meals to children and is fully licensed and regulated by the State of Colorado. The cost is $42.50 per week. Not surprisingly, there is a waiting list.

Other UFCW locals are bringing child and dependent care to the bargaining table. Local 1357 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, for example, recently negotiated with Acme Markets a $15.00 per member contribution to a Joint Labor-Management Retail Food Trust Fund, which will administer a day care service program.

The Retail Food Trust Fund, which expects to have the day care program in operation by January 1, 1988, will provide UFCW members with a choice of using the Trust Fund's own regional day care center for a small deductible co-payment fee or receiving an equivalent cash voucher to be used at the day care center of the member's choosing.

Our nation must recognize that women are in the workforce to stay, and must act now to address the growing child care crisis. Specific proposals include: grants and low-interest loans for development of child care facilities; additional incentives for employer-provided child care services; development of state voucher programs for middle-income families; and incentives for the establishment of cooperative child care facilities.

Two other serious problems that women in service industries face are the lack of basic health insurance and pension coverage. Only 42 percent of service sector employees work for employers who offer health plans. In reality, substantially fewer employees actually receive coverage. Most plans require full-time or near full-time employment before coverage, as a result, few part-time workers are eligible for medical benefits. Many plans also require extensive waiting periods, leaving workers uncovered during an initial three to 12 month period. In many cases, these factors combine to place women in an intolerable position -- they must either purchase insurance at exorbitant rates or do without medical coverage.

A similar situation exists for pension coverage. Only 25 percent of service sector employees work for employers who provide pension plans. Less than half of the women eligible for the plan will eventually vest. Low vesting rates are the result of two major factors -- part-time work and changing employment histories. Women who work part-time are often ineligible for pension coverage because many plans require full or near full-time hours for participation, making it difficult for part-time workers to accumulate enough hours to participate. The majority of UFCW contracts provide both health and pension coverage for part-time employees working as few as 20 hours per week. It is important to note that this benefit has not proved to be an extraordinary financial burden to our organized employers.

Moreover, many women move in and out of the workforce because of childbearing and rearing or relocation to accommodate a spouse's job. Few employers offer job security, health benefits or pensions that transfer from job to job, even when workers remain with the same employer or in the same industry. Additionally, women are many times more likely than men to work as temporaries, an employment status which is generally not covered in a benefit plan.

Workers' advocates offer a number of proposals for dealing with these problems. First, employers who have benefit plans should be required to extend them to part-time employees on a pro-rated basis. This would allow all employees of covered employers to participate in health and pension plans. To alleviate uncompensated health care problems, employers should be required to provide a minimum medical package to all employees. Second, a mechanism for pension portability should be established to ensure that workers who change jobs receive the pension rights to which they are entitled.

The late President John Kennedy once said, "A rising tide lifts all boats." There are, we believe, a number of legislative proposals that will create a rising tide that would greatly improve the economic status of all workers, and especially women workers. They include:

. Legislation to protect all worker's jobs in leveraged buyouts, sales of assets and corporate merger situations. Women often bear a disproportionate share of the economic dislocation that results from "merger mania."

. Legislation to restore the purchasing power of the minimum wage.

. Legislation to reduce America's mammoth trade deficit.

This is by no means a complete list of problems that working women face in today's service economy.

Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Committee, winning better conditions for all our members -- women as well as men -- is obviously our top priority. The UFCW and its local unions have made great strides in ending pay differentials, and inequities in hours and benefits. We view this not only as a fight at the bargaining table, but also a fight here in Congress. We appreciate the opportunity to appear today and look forward to working with the Congress and the Administration to meet and deal with these real life concerns of working women.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Mr. Wynn.
Ms. Marano.

STATEMENT OF CYNTHIA MARANO, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, WIDER OPPORTUNITIES FOR WOMEN, INC.

Ms. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, it is wonderful to be back before this committee again, and I thank you for the opportunity to talk with all of you about the needs of working women in the United States, especially as it relates to transitions to non-traditional employment.

I am Cynthia Morano, Director of Wider Opportunities for Women, a nonprofit national women's employment organization, located in Washington, DC, which works to create systemic change in employment policies, programs and practices to ensure economic independence and equality of opportunity for women.

I am going to take my testimony and summarize a number of the problems which I raised in the testimony and move fairly quickly into the remedies. Because I think we have heard a great deal about the data, and I would like to make some suggestions to you about some things that perhaps the committee might act on.

The growing numbers of women in poverty is of critical concern to my organization, Wider Opportunities for Women. You have heard a great deal about the poverty rates of women, particularly those in female-headed households.

I would like to just bring to your attention one issue that we haven't heard so much about this morning, and that is the situation of the working poor. Of those women working in the United States for pay, 4.3 million women are working for incomes which are too low to bring them out of poverty.

For these women, obtaining a job has not provided a route out of poverty.

Women represent 60 percent of all Americans aged 16 or over who have incomes below the poverty level. More than half of all women and 75 percent of mothers with children work to support themselves and their families. But the jobs women hold typically pay low wages.

Of the 8.4 million minimum wage earners, 64 percent are women. Women comprise 60 percent of those earning between $3.35 and $5.00 an hour, a wage that is below the national poverty threshold for a family of four.

The primary reason so many working women are in poverty is that women continue to be segregated in occupations with the lowest pay and most limited benefits. Currently close to 80 percent of women workers are still employed in clerical, service, retail sales, and factory operative jobs.

The presence of women in non-traditional occupations continues to be extremely limited. Women comprise only 2.4 percent of skilled craft workers in 1984. According to 1985 annual averages, women comprised 2 percent of workers in the construction trades generally. They were 0.5 percent of brick masons and stone masons, 1.2 percent of carpenters, and 3.1 percent of construction laborers. In many cases, these small numbers represented large gains from the past.

In 1984 WOW conducted a study of four high technology industries, industries reputed for their progressive personnel and human resource policies, to determine the status of female employment and opportunities for the future.

Many of the firms reviewed were Federal contractors, most had a high growth profile. We found the following: widespread prevailing occupational segregation; a visible lack of women in minorities in the highest paid and most responsible positions; and a persistent wage gap in positions where males and females were employed. Only in the telephone industry where there has been considerable affirmative action, scrutiny and litigation, was progress in the movement and promotion of women really apparent.

I would like to move now to talk with you a little bit about the remedies that we suggest. A multifaceted approach is essential to reducing the effects of occupational segregation and women's poverty.

Key elements include focusing on affirmative action, education and training programs which lead women to a broader spectrum of well paid work and pay equity.

WOW believes that enforcement of our Nation's affirmative action policies is critical to insuring economic independence and equal opportunities for women in minorities who continue to suffer the effects of past discrimination and who continue to face severe labor market underutilization.

As a trainer of women for non-traditional jobs, we experience firsthand the importance of a strong Federal affirmative action program in helping to overcome occupational segregation.

I don't need to tell this committee that recent studies confirm that affirmative action in the form of goals and timetables has contributed greatly to the gains that women have made in entering non-traditional jobs.

We are strongly committed to the retention and improved enforcement of Executive Order 11246 which we see as critical to women's transition into the labor market.

Our study of high technology industries, many of which, as I told you, are Federal contractors showed us that those affirmative action policies are simply not being enforced in those industries.

We were pleased that the Supreme Court findings in the Johnson case were so clear in upholding the use of affirmative action to remedy occupational segregation and the past discriminatory practices in the California Department of Transportation. This is a critical message to the Nation's employers.

But at the same time, members of our women's work force network across the country tell us that employers they are working with have experienced a substantial decline in enforcement or any kind of communication from the U.S. Department of Labor's OFCCP.

Adequate funding and special new initiatives by the Department of Labor may be needed to stimulate adequate enforcement. We would like to work with the committee on trying to design some new initiatives.

Special initiatives can make a difference. A look at the coal mining and shipbuilding industries show us how such measures can open up non-traditional employment opportunities for women.

I have outlined what some of those special initiatives have done in the past.

The data provides evidence that the scarcity of women in non-traditional jobs cannot be attributed to a lack of desire by women for those jobs or that their incomes would not be significantly increased if they had them. What we need is to see the affirmative action policies that are part of the law be enforced carefully.

Education and training programs also have the potential to positively affect women's economic status and participation in a broader spectrum of occupations. These programs can help in reducing women's poverty by training and channeling women into non-traditional occupations with better earnings and benefits.

Yet currently sex segregation continues in publicly funded education and training programs resulting in different training assignments, different outcomes, and different earnings for women.

The vocational education system has a great potential to assist women and girls entering non-traditional employment. About half of the 17 million students enrolled in federally-funded vocational education courses and programs are women. Yet, there is a great disparity between males and females in the kinds of programs in which they participate.

You all here in the committee and in the House Education and Labor Committee on the whole were very involved in the passage of the Perkins Act in 1984, and we worked to see that there were monies better targeted to women and girls.

The sex equity provisions of that act encouraged States to focus on eliminating sex bias and stereotyping in secondary and post-secondary vocational education. Yet research carried out by our organization and the National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education indicates that few states have funded or encouraged women to enter non-traditional training programs in any substantial numbers, even under the Perkins Act.

The Job Training Partnership Act emphasized sex equity in non-traditional training by requiring that efforts be made in all programs to develop training which contributes to occupational development, upward mobility, development of new careers, and overcoming sex stereotyping in occupations traditional for the other sex.

Yet all studies on State implementation of JTPA have indicated substantial variations by sex within specific training program assignments. Under JTPA, the majority of women participating continue to be placed in short-term classroom training leading to jobs in the clerical and service sector which result in low wages.

In addition, those provisions of JTPA which you here in the committee helped to establish to remove barriers to JTPA training for women are frequently not being implemented. Most local service deliverers in nearly every State have failed to use the 15 percent allowable costs for supportive services.

Few States have funded or implemented special efforts to train women in non-traditional occupations. Performance standards are being interpreted as an incentive to train participants in those occupations in which it is easiest to gain job placements and which are the least expensive for which to train.

Training low income women for non-traditional jobs tends to take longer, cost more, and result in a longer placement period. Yet the results of this type of training include higher wages, better benefits, and a greater impact in overall economic terms.

I can't talk about education and training for women without examining the situation in welfare employment programs. Both State and federally funded welfare employment programs have tended to continue the occupational segregated training found in vocational education in JTPA. This is particularly disturbing given the need of adult welfare recipients who are more than 90 percent female to gain jobs which will provide wages and benefits which can result in economic self sufficiency.

We urge you to continue to do all you can—and you have done a great deal already, but we want you to do more—to ensure that quality training for jobs with the prospect of decent wages and benefits continues to be a focus of the current welfare reform debate.

My reading of the paper in the last few days has made me even more concerned about the welfare reform process yet ahead of us. While I congratulate this committee's work on this issue, I think we have yet much to do.

Equitable training, affirmative action enforcement are key strategies in affecting women's participation in non-traditional employment and overall women's economic security. Other strategies such as implementing pay equity initiatives, which you have heard about earlier in these hearings, and increasing the minimum wage are crucial in reducing women's poverty.

Certainly the kind of child care legislation which is part of the Economic Equity Act and that which Mr. Hawkins has introduced are other important strategies.

No single strategy is enough or will affect enough women. The approach needs to be extensive and multifaceted to overcome historical employment discrimination and occupational segregation.

I thank you for the chance to come before you, and I look forward to your questions.

[Prepared statement of Cynthia Marano follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF CYNTHIA MARANO, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, WIDER OPPORTUNITIES FOR WOMEN, INC.

INCREASING WOMEN'S ECONOMIC EQUITY:

GREATER ACCESS TO NONTRADITIONAL JOBS

Good morning, I am Cynthia Marano, Executive Director of Wider Opportunities for Women (WOW), a non-profit national women's employment organization, located in Washington, DC which works to create systemic change in employment policies, programs, and practices to ensure economic independence and equality of opportunity for women. Since 1964, WOW has provided outreach, career counseling, skill training, educational assistance, job development, and job placement for more than 3,000 women in the Washington, DC metropolitan area. WOW also provides leadership to a national network of community women's employment and training programs, public administrators, employers, and other policy makers interested in expanding women's employment options. The network reaches into 48 states and into the lives of more than 300,000 individual women who seek to improve their employment opportunities and economic status.

Women's Poverty

The growing numbers of women living in poverty is of critical concern to WOW. The poverty rate for female-headed families is 34% -- more than five times the poverty rate for married couples. Although female headed households are only 17% of all families, they represent 47% of America's families in poverty.

Of those women working in the U.S. for pay, 4.3 million women are working for incomes which are too low to bring them out of poverty. For these women, obtaining a job has not provided a route out of poverty. These women comprise the growing numbers of Americans who are "the working poor." The numbers of women who work and remain in poverty are rapidly growing and WOW believes this issue requires national attention. There are a number of reasons why employment does not always provide a path out of poverty for women. Occupational segregation, the undervaluing of women's work, and a bias toward the hiring and promotion of men are major contributors.

Women represent 60% of all Americans aged 16 and over who have incomes below the poverty level. More than half of all women and 75% of mothers with children work to support themselves and their families. But the jobs women hold typically pay low wages. Of the 8.4 million minimum wage earners, 64% are women. And women comprise 60% of those earning between $3.35 and $5.00 an hour -- a wage that is below the national poverty threshold for a family of four. Women's earnings are often lower than men's because women who work are often forced to take part-time jobs, even though they prefer to work full-time. 7.2 million women are involuntary part-time workers, earning only 58% of the average hourly wage for full-time workers.

Occupational Segregation

The primary reason so many working women are in poverty is that women continue to be segregated in occupations with the lowest pay and most limited benefits. Currently, close to 80% of women workers are employed in clerical, service, retail sales, and factory operative jobs. Nearly twice as many men as women hold managerial and administrative jobs in the economy; nearly three times as many men as women own their businesses.

The heavy concentration of women in low paying "women's jobs" contributes to a wide and persistent gap between the wages of women and men. Women earn only 64 cents for every dollar earned by men. When working full time, women continue to earn less then men in every job category, including those in which women predominate. Yet the wage gap narrows when women work in jobs that are traditionally held by men. (See Appendix A) Women are less likely to live in poverty when they are employed in non-traditional jobs.

Despite some evidence of male nurses and female carpenters, overall the labor market remains sharply segregated. The vast majority of women today work in jobs that are very similar to those held by their grandmothers two decades ago.

The presence of women in nontraditional occupations is extremely limited. Women comprised only 2.4% of skilled crafts workers in 1984. According to 1985 annual averages, women

comprised 2% of workers in the construction trades generally: they were .5% of brickmasons and stonemasons, 1.2% of carpenters, and 3.1% of construction laborers. And, in may cases, these small numbers represent large gains from the past. By 1981, there were 802,000 women employed in the skilled trades, more than double the number in 1970 and almost four times the number in 1960. The numbers of women apprentices increased from less than 2,000 in 1973 to more than 5,000 at the end of 1984. Black women have made inroads into occupations such as bus driver, delivery person and truck driver. These advances, however, are relative; they are great only because women have so far to go in gaining access to nontraditional jobs.

That occupational segregation and discrimination persist in new, dynamic, and high growth industries is particularly disturbing.

In 1984, WOW conducted a study of four high technology industries -- industries reputed for their progressive personnel and human resource policies -- to determine the status of female employment and opportunities for the future. Many of the firms reviewed were federal contractors. Most had high growth profile.

WOW found the following:

** widespread, prevailing occupational segregation;

** a visible lack of women and minorities in the highest paid and most responsible positions; and

** a persistent wage gap in positions where males and females were employed.

Only in the telephone industry, where there has been considerable affirmative action scrutiny and litigation, was progress in the movement and promotion of women apparent.

Rather than creating an opportunity, expanding technology has presented new crises for many women. It has been estimated that almost 80% of women are concentrated in jobs that will be changed, eliminated, or made obsolete by technological advances and automation. If opportunities in the technical arena do not expand in more nontraditional areas, women's employment status will be seriously affected.

Studies of other trades or occupational groups have yielded dismal results as well. The Southeast Women's Employment Coalition (SWEC) analyzed U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) figures of female participation in the workforces of 39 state departments of transportation. SWEC found that nationwide, fewer than 4% of highway jobs are held by women; one-fourth of 1% by women of color. The findings, released in 1985, focused on the promotion and hiring of women and minorities in six states. In California, only 17% of DOT employees were female and more than half worked in office or clerical positions. The department underemployed women in all other categories, and to reach parity with the civilian workforce, DOT would have had to hire 5,306 women and minority males. In Georgia, females constituted fewer

than 10% of DOT employees, and no women served in official, administrative, or skilled craft positions. And in New York, women were less than 12.3% of the DOT workforce, and black women only one-half of one percent.

San Francisco Women in the Trades, a municipal employees organization interested in improving the status of women working in nontraditional jobs in the city, studied San Francisco's record of hiring women in nontraditional, skilled occupations in 1986. San Francisco has an affirmative action policy that requires 45% of nontraditional jobs be filled by women. But the good intentions of city elected officials have not been carried out in city hiring practices.

San Francisco Women in the Trades found women in only one of the city's 60 plumbing jobs; 1 of the 73 auto mechanic positions; 2 of the 145 stationary engineering positions; 17 of the 222 laborer positions; and 4 of the 250 engineering jobs. Every one of San Francisco's electrical and plumbing inspectors, firefighters, and police sergeants and lieutenants were male. And these findings are especially ironic, since San Francisco has the largest population of skilled tradeswomen of any major metro area in the country.

REMEDIES

A multi-faceted approach is essential to reducing the effects of occupational segregation on women's poverty. Key elements include focusing on affirmative action, education and training programs' which lead women to a broader spectrum of well-paid work, and pay equity.

Affirmative Action

WOW believes that enforcement of our nation's affirmative action policies is critical to ensuring economic independence and equal opportunities for women and minorities who continue to suffer the effects of past discrimination and who continue to face severe labor market underutilization. As a trainer of women for nontraditional jobs, WOW experiences first-hand the importance of a strong federal affirmative action program in helping to overcome occupational segregation.

Recent studies confirm that affirmative action, in the form of goals and timetables, has contributed to the gains that women have made in entering nontraditional jobs. WOW is therefore strongly committed to the retention and improved enforcement of Executive Order 11246 which we believe is critical to women's transition into the labor market. In 1983 and 1984, studies of the federal enforcement of Executive Order 11246 comparing

contractor and noncontractor establishments found that affirmative action has been successful in promoting the employment of minorities and females.

Moreover, only through the use of gender and race conscious measures can women gain access to jobs from which they have been excluded in the past. Such measures serve not only as a prod to employers to recruit, hire, and promote qualified women, but as evidence to interested women that nontraditional jobs are an option for them.

WOW was pleased that the Supreme Court findings in the Johnson case were so clear in upholding the use of affirmative action to remedy occupational segregation and the past discriminatory practices in the California Department of Transportation. This is a critical message to the nation's employers. But at the same time, members of our Network nationwide tell us that employers across the county have experienced a substantial decline in enforcement from the U.S. Department of Labor's OFCCP. Adequate funding and special new initiatives by the Department of Labor may be needed to stimulate adequate enforcement.

Such special initiatives can make a difference. A look at the coal mining and shipbuilding industries show how such measures can open up nontraditional jobs for women. There were no women coal miners in 1973. In the 1970's, after pressure and litigation from women's organizations, the OFCCP targeted the coal mining

industry as one of several industries to focus on in its enforcement activities. The result was that coal mine operators began to comply with their affirmative action obligations under Executive Order 11246, as amended. The gains achieved for women because of this focus were dramatic: by December 1980, 3,295 women had become coal miners. Thus, because of affirmative action, the percentage of women hired in the industry went from 0 to 8.7% in seven years. Similarly, the numbers of women workers dramatically increased when the Maritime Administration required shipbuilding contractors to establish goals and timetables for women. The contractors found that as more women were hired, more applied.

This data provides evidence that the scarcity of women in nontraditional jobs cannot be attributed to a lack of desire by women for those jobs. When occupations become open, women have responded by moving into them.

Employment, Training and Educational Programs

Education and training programs also have the potential to positively affect women's economic status and participation in the labor force. These programs can help in reducing women's poverty by training and channeling women into nontraditional occupations with better earnings and benefits. Yet, currently sex segregation continues in publicly funded education and training programs and

results in different training assignments, different outcomes and different earnings for women.

The vocational education system has great potential to assist women and girls enter nontraditional employment. About half of the 17 million students enrolled in federally funded vocational education courses and programs are women.

Yet there is great disparity between males and females in the kinds of programs in which they participate, and in the long-term economic consequences of their program choices. About 7 million students are enrolled in occupationally specific programs. In 1980, 78.8 percent of the female students in these programs were enrolled in traditionally "female" activities -- nursing, secretarial and food services. In secondary vocational education programs, nearly 70 percent of the female students are currently enrolled in programs leading to jobs and occupations that pay below-average wages. For post-secondary vocational and technical school programs, the corresponding figures is 60 percent. This pattern of sex segregation in vocational education perpetuates the economic disadvantage of women in the general labor force.

Research indicates that because the female labor market experience is different from that of men, many women and girls need a comprehensive array of services to prepare for the labor market. These services include: adequate, affordable and accessible child care; transportation assistance; basic education skills; career exploration; job search skills; life skills; and

transition to work assistance. They may also need remedial math and science, hands on experience, and physical conditioning, depending upon the type of employment opportunity they seek. There is a need to develop and incorporate these services into nontraditional training programs for women.

The Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984, as this Committee is aware, emphasizes the delivery of targeted services to women and girls. The Sex Equity provisions of this Act encouraged states to focus on eliminating sex bias and stereotyping in secondary and post-secondary vocational education. Yet research indicates that few states have funded or encouraged women to enter nontraditional training programs in any substantial numbers. In a 16 state study of implementation of the Act, WOW and the National Coalition of Women and Girls in Education found few nontraditional programs in operation.

The Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) also emphasizes sex equity and nontraditional training by requiring that efforts be made in all programs to develop training which "contributes to occupational development, upward mobility, development of new careers, and overcoming sex stereotyping in occupations traditional for the other sex." Yet all studies on state implementation of JTPA have indicated substantial variations by sex within specific training program assignments. Under JTPA, the majority of women participating continue to be placed in short term classroom training leading to jobs in the clerical and

service sector, which result in lower wages. In addition, those provisions of JTPA which Congress established to remove barriers to JTPA training for women are frequently not being implemented. Most local service deliverers and nearly every state have failed to use the 15% allowable costs for supportive services. Few states have funded or implemented special efforts to train women in nontraditional occupations. Performance standards are being interpreted as an incentive to train participants in these occupations in which it is easiest to gain job placements and in the least expensive training categories. Training low income women for nontraditional jobs tends to take longer, cost more, and result in a longer placement period. Yet the results of this type of training include higher wages, better benefits, and a greater impact in overall economic terms.

While the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor and WOW have provided extensive technical assistance to regions and states on this issue, JTPA administrators on the whole have continued to invest largely in lower impact training. Incentives may need to be added to JTPA, if we wish to see expanded nontraditional training for women.

A discussion of education and training for women cannot be complete without examining welfare employment programs. Both state and federally-funded welfare employment programs have tended to continue the occupationally segregated training found in vocational education and JTPA. This is particularly disturbing

given the need of adult welfare recipients, who are more than 90% female, to gain jobs which will provide wages and benefits which can result in economic self-sufficiency. WOW urges the Committee to do all it can to ensure that quality training for jobs with a prospect of decent wages and benefits continues to be a focus in the current welfare reform debate. As I'm sure my testimony makes clear, any job is not the answer for women and families in poverty, and we must ensure that this reality becomes the basis for our welfare employment policies.

Equitable education and training programs, and affirmative action enforcement are key strategies in affecting women's participation in nontraditional employment and overall women's economic security. Other strategies such as implementing pay equity initiatives which you've heard about earlier in these hearings and increasing the minimum wage are also crucial in reducing women's poverty. No single strategy is enough or will affect enough women. The approach needs to be extensive and multi-faceted to overcome historical employment discrimination and occupational segregation.

I thank you for the chance to discuss these issues with the Subcommittee and for your continued vigilance over affirmative action and employment and training issues. WOW will work with you to monitor how the programs you oversee are implemented and what effects they have on the future economic security of women and girls. We look forward to working with you to find new strategies to achieve greater progress in the years ahead. New strategies are needed to hasten the decline in women's poverty and its extension to further generations of American families.

SEX-COMPOSITION AND MEAN ANNUAL EARNINGS OF SELECTED OCCUPATIONS: 1980

Occupation[1]	% Female	Mean Annual Earnings
Secretaries	99.0	$10,622
Bookkeepers/Acctng clerks	91.8	10,420
Bank tellers	93.5	8,458
Nursing aides/Orderlies	90.5	8,433
Teachers, elementary	85.2	13,411
Cashiers	82.9	8,777
Typists	96.3	9,553
Sales clerks	71.2	8,130
Waiters/Waitresses	80.1	6,554
Data entry keyers	93.5	10,217
Clinical lab technician	72.3	17,398
Registered Nurses*	94.3	18,255
Accountants & Auditors	39.5	17,055
Lawyers*	14.2	26,319
Teachers, post-secondary subject not specified*	35.2	19,130
Social Workers*	63.8	16,873
Librarians*	82.8	16,324

Occupation[1]	% Male	Mean Annual Earnings
Blue-collar supervisors	89.7	$21,290
Supervisors in sales occup.	59.8	21,135
Janitors and sextons	80.9	12,130
Automobile mechanic	96.8	14,443
Laborers, exc. construc.	88.5	13,551
Carpenters	98.6	15,086
Welders and Cutters	95.4	16,431
Electricians	98.4	19,429
Machinists	96.2	17,115
Industrial Machine/Heavy machine repair, inc. diesel	99.3	17,171
Accountants & Auditors	61.5	23,835
Lawyers	85.8	41,362
Teachers, post-secondary subject not specified*	64.8	25,642
Physicians*	86.3	71,972
Engineers*	98.4	30,374

*among workers age 35-44 with 5 or more years of college

[1]year-round, full-time workers

Sources: U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics
U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you very much.

Ms. Marano, the first question I have for you is, in your testimony you described that one of the telephone companies, was evidently carrying out affirmative action and that there was progress in that telephone company. Can I ask the name of that telephone company?

Ms. MARANO. Well, fascinatingly enough, Mr. Martinez, the situation is that because of the suits in particular companies, we see a better situation for women in minorities across the telephone communication industry, I think because the situation is that there is a belief that something might be done. I think clearly I am referring to the AT&T situation earlier.

Mr. MARTINEZ. The reason I raised that question is because earlier I said I have three working daughters and two working daughters-in-law, and they have had their obstacles to overcome in trying to create careers for themselves.

Two of those daughters work for the telephone company, one particular telephone company on the West Coast. You can imagine which one it is. Contrary to what progress has been made in affirmative action, it has been very selective and tokenism. I can attest to that, not only because I have two daughters working for the telephone company, but I still have one son working for the telephone company. He was a typical kind of Hispanic who it was easy to use as a token because he was so Americanized.

But he has not seen the progress that his ability, warrants. Maybe I am prejudiced because they are my children, but there have been times where he has had glowing reports from his supervisors which have not materialized in the kind of promotion that the time that he has put in and the efforts he has put in should have merited him.

Which leads me to another question. A lot of us fall into a false sense of security that because we are minorities and we succeed to where we are, that everything is all right. The most ridiculous statement I hear over and over again is, especially as someone referred to the chairman of the Civil Rights Commission, as someone who really has blinders on to the fact that somehow he feels that because he succeeded, ignories the fact that he may have been more aggressive and may have had a little more talent than the average person has, that because he can do it, everybody else can do it without providing access.

See, the problem in this country has always been that we are the land of opportunity, tremendous opportunity. But that opportunity hasn't been accessible to all, especially women.

You know, we talk about things that are needed. You talked about child care and all of that. I continue to say, we keep talking; when are we going to do something? When are we going to provide that access to that opportunity I say we may all be created equal, and we naturally know that some of us are going to excel in some areas more than others, but to whatever degree and in whatever area that we can excel, we ought to be provided the opportunity to go as far as our ambition and desire carry, and not be hindered by false standards and sets of discriminations built in by some traditional experiences from before, but move on and move forward so that we do provide access to that opportunity for every individual.

I still see in this country, the great discrimination that exists out there.

So where we do see some affirmative action and some companies working, it is not working fast enough or long enough or far enough to really make this an opportunity for everyone.

One of the things I would like you to touch on a little bit because your testimony touched partly on it is, even though we are seeing more access to non-traditional jobs for women, has it become any easier for them? Are they really all of a sudden melting away the opposition that they have had traditionally for years? Or even yet does the necessity for them to prove themselves beyond what that normal male would have had to prove himself in that same particular job still exist?

Ms. MARANO. I am delighted that you have asked me the question because clearly the barriers which women experience in moving into non-traditional occupations continue apace. The kind of stats that I shared with you that shows less than five percent, for example, in women in particular trades shows you that the barriers are there and they are very entrenched.

Women in our training program who are going into non-traditional jobs in the trades and in technical occupations find sexual harassment alive and well in America today, find discriminatory hiring practices, get stuck and aren't promoted, find themselves isolated. Sure, they have to prove themselves at a greater level than is the case with many men.

I think the important message, however, that I want to leave with you is that we have made some gains, and they have been very small. But those gains are really dependent upon the enforcement of the policies which this committee has helped to ensure.

We aren't going to continue to have even that limited progress if we don't have enforcement of affirmative action. The experiences of the members of your family I think are the kinds of experiences of women and minorities continuously across this country. No industry is free of it.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you.

Mr. Wynn, you touched on increasing problems of low wages and part time employees and you have offered some of the solutions to day care that some of your locals have initiated, which is very supportive of the women being able to move out and move into jobs and upward mobility.

What are some of the other suggestions you can give us of things that we might do as a committee or as a Congress that might facilitate the employment and equal pay for women and the ability for them to enter into better jobs by providing day care, supportive services?

Mr. WYNN. Well, certainly one of them, Mr. Chairman, would be to increase the minimum wage. Certainly the minimum wage law in this country needs to be increased. It would have a great impact on women because, as I said in my statement, and I think was said before here, that unfortunately many of the women in this country work in jobs that are at the minimum wage level or just slightly above.

Despite the fact of what our union did in Colorado and what our union did in Philadelphia—and the one in Philadelphia has, in my

opinion, even a greater impact because if you analyze Colorado, you are talking about a situation where we are only taking care of 88 children. The potential in Philadelphia because of the local union's ability to negotiate day care money from the employer and create a system whereby, as an example, we probably have 30,000 members in the city of Philadelphia, and without a doubt the same breakdown on women and men would exist there. There are thousands of children that could benefit from that. So certainly that will be one of our priorities.

However, there are millions upon millions of workers that work in retail stores that don't have the right to have a union contract or are not covered by a union contract and don't have that. Certainly this Congress should give thought to developing a day care system in this country that provides proper assistance to our children and permits women to work at a job that is not a luxury but a necessity.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Over the history of our country, women's role in the work force has changed. Traditionally, in the beginning only single women worked, and it was expected that most women got married and raised a family and stayed at home and took care of the family, which is no simple job. I had five children and had nobody to watch the children while my wife was having each one of those children. So I had to stay home and take my vacation at a time when she was having the baby. And believe me, that's no easy job. I wouldn't trade jobs for a million dollars. In fact, I couldn't do the job as well as she did.

But the thing is, we need to understand, because of economics more than any other reason, women started to go to work to help the family to make ends meet because the economy got tougher. Finally through that experience there were young women that just decided, hey, rather than being married right away, I want a career. And they started getting professionally oriented and started to move out, not just to help the family make ends meet, but to provide for themselves because that is what they wanted to do and they wanted to have a career. So it has changed.

Yet, our system of dealing with that tremendous influx of women in the work force has not changed as rapidly as the work force has changed. It seems to me that your union has maybe come to the front in understanding and realizing some of the problems and working to correct them. The child day care centers is one of the most important things. We have talked and talked about that.

Some States, like Massachusetts, have already started to provide that. California has done a little bit of a job on that. But we need to do this on a national basis.

I think that one of the witnesses was testifying what our role is and flexibility on a local level. Well, our role is that when that flexibility on the local level allows those local level officials to cop out and not live up to responsibility that they need to, then we should step in with national legislation that requires them to.

Would you comment on that?

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, I certainly agree that I think day care centers are a Federal responsibility. We would applaud those States that have already moved in that direction. But if we think the rest of the States in this country are going to move in that di-

rection, if we had to wait for that time, none of us would see it during our time.

So, yes, I think it is a Federal responsibility. There are probably millions, and I don't have any data on this, but there are thousands, if not millions, of women going to work on a daily basis, and many of them are leaving their children home unattended. In a society as rich as this country is, that question clearly needs to be addressed. And it is the responsibility of the Federal Government, you are absolutely correct.

It could be a time in our history when it was just basically single women who were working, or it was women who were supplementing the income of the husband. But the economics of this country today make it very difficult—only in the rarest cases where the husband is making such a salary that one person, that a husband can provide for that family.

So a job that a woman is performing today is out of necessity and not out of luxury. Because of that, it creates certain problems that this Federal Government needs to deal with.

Mr. MARTINEZ. I agree with you.

Ms. Crim, the pregnancy thing is something that women have always had to contend with and the fear of losing their job because they become pregnant. It is ridiculous that even today that there are States where an employer can release a woman from her job because she got pregnant.

You know, the basis of that bill is really to provide women protection, something that is very equitable. In many cases if a male were ill and maybe took off as much time because of an extended illness, somehow or other his job in many cases would be vacant. Sometimes they lose their jobs too. So this is a bill that covers almost a multitude of sin. When I say sin, I consider it a sin that because somebody in circumstances beyond his control is not able to work and still can come back and be a valuable work participant in the work force is denied that opportunity. Would you comment on that?

Ms. CRIM. Well, I thought it was kind of interesting, one of the companies that we interviewed was Levi Strauss and Company in California. They provide a disability leave of about I think six to eight weeks, and then in addition there is another three or four months of child care leave. The disability leave is paid and the child care leave is unpaid. But the company has the policy that they think it is a good idea to let the parents bond with their children, as Representative Schroeder mentioned earlier this morning.

I talked to one of the personnel officials of Levi Strauss and he said that for the most part managers liked the policy, they thought it was a good policy, and the company liked the fact that about 95 percent of pregnant women came back. They didn't just have the baby and decide to stay home with the baby. They came back. He attributed that partially to the fact that it was a five month leave.

But he said that sometimes managers resented the child care leave. He said, we get comments from managers like, well, why can't I just replace her? She has been gone for five months. But it was interesting that he said they didn't resent the disability part because in their minds that was the same as a man who is gone with a heart attack, or a woman who is gone with a heart attack,

for example, is out for six to eight weeks or whatever. But there is something about that extra three or four months that appears from our interviews in here that maybe it is not quite at the same level. It is nice that you can go home and bond with the child, but look at what is happening at the office.

So I thought that was kind of interesting.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you.

Mr. Owens.

Mr. OWENS. I have two or three questions that I will ask all at once. They are primarily directed to Mr. Wynn, but the rest of you may comment.

I think Mr. Wynn mentioned something about the impact of temporary employees on this whole problem. I wondered if you find that the temporary employment agencies are being used to wreck unionisation efforts. Are they particularly using—do they find women particularly useful in this process. Minorities in general have always had the situation where they desperately needed jobs, and they have been misused in unionization situations to break strikes and to undercut efforts to organize. What is the impact of more women being in the work force on that process? Are women subject to special kinds of harassment? Do we need a new look at our labor laws and the way we enforce them in terms of the vulnerability of women in that situation?

We always talk about sexual harassment, but there are other forms of intimidation which I think may relate more to unionization and efforts to protect themselves like any other worker. I would like for you to start, but the other two may comment.

Mr. WYNN. It certainly could be used for that, but I don't think that's the basic design. Not all part time workers in this country shun away from joining the union. A lot of them are very supportive of a union. Certainly it is not a female issue. Just because you are a woman—millions of women make up the labor movement. They are among the most militant people and very supportive of the labor movement.

Basically the part time and the expansion of part time workers is created because of economic reasons. They pay them substantially less wages. They pay them little, if any, benefits. In most situations there are no benefits.

So basically a company does it from an economics standpoint. Now you could take that situation and say that there would be some situations where a person wouldn't want to join a union, but primarily an employer does it because it is a cost saving feature to the company.

Ms. MARANO. I would like to just speak to that for one moment. In our network of women's employment programs around the country we are seeing more and more women who are having to take part time jobs because they can't find full time jobs. I think there is an enormous myth that most women who work part time do so because they like it and it is easier.

In fact, it is 7.2 million women in the United States who are working part time involuntarily. They would prefer to have full time employment. And those workers earn only 58 percent of the average hourly wage for full time workers.

So you see that part of the poverty that we are looking at comes from folks who are working part time who really would prefer not to.

We have seen this particularly in placing women in retail environments. Jobs that used to be full time are becoming increasingly part time jobs. I agree that it is for cost savings reasons from the employers' perspective, but it is becoming an enormous barrier, particularly for female heads of households.

We have seen jobs, for example, in retail stores that used to be good entry level non-traditional positions being made part time. So the very people who most wanted those jobs as a way into a better wage find that they no longer can take them. They don't have the benefits, and of course the end result wages are significantly less.

The other issue is the issue you raised, which is the contingent worker, the temporary workers and people who are being brought on to the labor market as consultants or workers without wages.

I think we do have to take a look at it and what is happening.

Mr. OWENS. Does either one of you know of any situation where a large supplier of temporary employees has also been unionized?

Ms. CRIM. I don't. Do you?

Mr. WYNN. No, I do not.

Mr. OWENS. No further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Mr. Owens.

Mr. Hayes.

Mr. HAYES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

You know, I want to be quite candid. I appreciate the testimony. The witnesses have been invaluable to us. But I am not optimistic, I'll be very honest with you, in getting this administration, even people of my own party, some of them, to do a 180 degree turn and so some of the things that would be solutions to some of the problems.

As we proceed now to, we are going to be talking about deficit reduction heavily over the next few months. And we have people who are part of this group who don't see some of the things that we have been talking about as a human issue. The easiest way to reduce the deficit, reduce the burden of the Federal Government is to cut out some of the existing programs that we have been talking about here now.

I don't have an answer as to how we put the pressure to change the course on which we are going now. Mr. Wynn, I know you know, by my own background, I thought I knew a lot as a trade unionist. But when I look at this body of which I am a part of now and how it functions on some of these issues, and the little regard that they have for the welfare of people. You just heard one of the better departments in some respects in terms of the way it is conceptually run, the Department of Labor. They are setting their sights towards the year 2000. We have 12 and a half years before we reach that plateau.

We are talking about poverty being on the rise, as it is now. And that is actually true. I represent from the point of view of per capita income probably one of the poorest districts, if not the poorest, in these whole United States where unemployment runs among our youth particularly better than 50 percent with no prospect for the future.

What I would like to see, I guess, is some real look-see on the part of the trade union movement on this whole economic bill of rights which we have just, along with my colleague here, Hawkins, have just again is a re-enactment of what we committed ourselves to do a number of years ago—begin to gear ourselves towards a goal of trying to seek full employment.

This is the answer to much of what we have been talking about. We can't even reach the point where we can make education our number one objective. We don't see yet how important it is to begin to train our youth to take over the responsibility of leadership, and particularly if the economically disadvantaged come from those kinds of families who want to spend less money on public education.

I've got kids in my district who don't eat after the third week of the month until they go to school. Yet, we have people here who want to reduce the amount of money that we are now spending for that purpose.

I only use these as examples to point out to you the severity of the problem which we are now faced with. And I wish that I could get more of an understanding, more of a commitment, on the part of people who are from organizations like you represent to really begin to flex their muscles.

I don't have the answers exactly as to how, but I do think we need to do something about the job program. I don't think we are yet.

The minimum wage is going to come up this year, but you ought to hear some of the arguments against increasing the minimum wage. It sounds like the argument that is being used by those who are against sanctions in South Africa. When they say to us, if we push for sanctions, we are going to throw people out of work in South Africa. If we push for minimum wage, people testify right before our committee, that all you are going to do is increase the number of people who are unemployed by pushing that.

We know that isn't true. This is their kind of argument. This is the mentality of some of the people who are now guiding the destiny, who even overlooked $20 million that has been lost in these hearings we are having. I wish I could help find it and get it into my First District. It would help an awful lot. We don't even deal with these kind of questions.

I will just cut it off by saying that we need your help. We need your advice. We are your friends here on this committee. But God knows, it looks like we are grossly outnumbered among those 435 people out there in that House.

I think we are going to get a big push for the economic bill of rights that is going to be made this year, but we need some pressures on some of the people who you particularly, Brother Wynn, have supported.

I don't think it is enough to just support some of these congressmen without dollars of our members who contribute to a political action fund because they support us 51 percent of the time. We have to establish some of our own priorities, single out those things which are most important to us, and maybe sometime reward people who support us on some of these things and punish those who don't.

79-107 0 - 87 - 5

Mr. WYNN. I feel like, congressman, you are giving me a sermon. I couldn't agree with you more. There are a variety of legislative agendas that are before this body that will deal with many of—not just for people who happen to be members of the union. You know as well as I do, because of your broad experience in the labor movement, the AFL–CIO, when they propose legislation, it is just not applicable to union members, it is applicable to workers. And in fact, in most cases, what the AFL–CIO is proposing is to assist those who are non-members because they don't have the benefits that many union members have in this country.

And there is no single one. I think it is a variety. But if you want to talk about the corporate takeover in this country needs to be changed so that it can be fair, so that it gives protection to workers; if you want to talk about if we need a trade bill in this country—and I know that we are not dealing with that question right now—but if you want to talk about taking care of workers, whether they are union members or whether they are men or women or whether they are black or white or what color they might be, we need some system of equity. We unfortunately have a government, not just Republican or Democrat, that on occasion has always talked about the fairness of having an open market, and a market where the goods can flow in and out of this country with no restriction. That's outstanding.

Except, we don't have that system around the world. As a layman, or as an outsider just representing working men and women in the union, I don't see our government protecting the rights of workers in the same manner as many other foreign countries protect their workers' rights.

So there is a broad agenda before this Congress. We will do everything that we can to support those who support working men and women, not just members of the UFCW, or not just members of the AFL–CIO.

Naturally, it has always been our position that those who don't support working men and women, that we attempt to punish them. We don't always accomplish that, but certainly we attempt to.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Mr. Hayes.

By the way, when Charlie was talking about the 51 percenters, he wasn't talking about me or Gus. We both have hundred percent records.

Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HAWKINS. Let me just shorten my contribution. I would like to thank the witnesses. I think they have been very invaluable.

I would like to agree with my colleague. I certainly think he is right. I think that his economic bill of rights which updates the Roosevelt Bill of Rights is a flag around which all of us can march. I certainly think it is in sharp contrast to the Reagan so-called bill of rights.

I am a little more optimistic. I have lived long enough to know that people go only so far before their intolerance gives out and they begin to wake up and come back to their senses. I think that that is what we are looking for at this time. Certainly we need to hurry up and try to accomplish that reawakening of the people.

I think your hearing has been wonderful, Mr. Chairman. I have learned more about, not only about the problems, but also about

your lovely family as we go through these hearings. Thank you very much.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Let me just close by saying that I think what Mr. Hawkins is talking about is that we return to sanity. The so-called new policies that were to take place are the failed policies, that turned out to be worse failed policies. I think that the frustration of many of the members is beginning to take its toll, and the resistance is beginning to grow to those failed policies that exist today. And we should see some changes hopefully.

I want to thank the witnesses for appearing before us today and congratulate you and commend you for your excellent testimony. Thank you.

[Whereupon, at 12:51 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

A PROSPECTUS OF WORKING WOMEN'S CONCERNS

WEDNESDAY, JULY 22, 1987

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:36 a.m., in room 2175 Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Matthew G. Martinez (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Members present. Representatives Martinez, Hayes, Owens, Jontz, Hawkins, and Gunderson.

Staff present: Eric Jensen, Valerie White, Tammy Harrison.

Full committee staff present: Shirely Wilshire.

Minority staff present: Mary Gardner.

Mr. MARTINEZ. It is a pleasure to welcome all of you here today. We are joined on the panel by the Honorable Chairman of the full Education and Labor Committee, the Honorable Gus Hawkins.

I will go ahead and make my opening statement.

Today is the second day of the Employment Opportunities Subcommittee's hearings on the prospectus of women in the work force. Yesterday's witnesses described in detail many of the obstacles facing working women. Today we will look closer at the specific concerns of women workers.

Although the number of women entering the labor force each year continues to increase, many women are still confined to enter at levels under-employing their education, training and skills and still being paid less than men for comparable work. Moreover, because employers often fail to provide incentives for maximum individual productivity, the under-utilization shortchanges them as well.

A lack of adequate and affordable child care also deters many women from reaching their full career potential. This problem of reasonable day care most often affects those who need working incomes the most. Low income families and working women whose earnings are below the poverty level are extremely affected by this.

Tragically, it is estimated that by the year 2000 nearly all adults on welfare will be women. The feminization of poverty is one of the most important concerns that the U.S. faces today.

Congress is addressing this issue through welfare reform legislation introduced this session. However, it must be emphasized that women requiring welfare assistance are not just women of working age. More and more retiring women who have never required

public assistance are forced to depend on welfare because of a lack of adequate pension and retirement benefits for part-time and temporary employees and those who have not been constant participants in the work force.

Today's testimony will address some of these problems, and H.R. 2577, which was introduced early last week by Pat Schroeder and our first witness today, the Honorable Congressperson Olympia Snowe, an omnibus bill which addresses the problems facing working women and their families. I look forward to hearing from Congresswomen Snowe and the rest of the witnesses today.

With that, we will begin.

Mr. Chairman, do you have a statement to make?

Mr. HAWKINS. Not at this time. Thank you.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Then we will proceed with Congresswoman Snowe.

STATEMENT OF HON. OLYMPIA SNOWE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MAINE

Ms. SNOWE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First, I would like to express my gratitude and appreciation to you and members of this subcommittee for holding these hearings. As co-chair of the Congressional Caucus, I am especially pleased that you are willing to address a number of the critical issues facing women in the workplace. And as your witness list of yesterday and today suggests obviously this is a multi-dimensional problem that needs to be addressed by the Congress. Hopefully, it will be a priority of the Congress to begin to tackle some of the key issues facing women in the workplace.

It is still a sad fact of American life, Mr. Chairman, that there are wide-ranging and definite problems that are facing women. These are obstacles which prevent women from becoming full and equal participants in society. The unique demands and the roadblocks with which women must contend have hindered their personal as well as their professional development to an unacceptably high degree.

In an attempt to rectify a number of the problems that women are facing, the Caucus has introduced once again the Economic Equity Act of 1987. We have done so since 1981, although the components of the package have changed as provisions have been enacted by the Congress.

This year we identified two major responsibilities of American women; that is, of course, work and family. Balancing the competing needs and demands and interests of work and family are at the center of life for millions of American women. No longer do we have the number of households that fit the traditional pattern of the father going to work and the mother staying at home taking care of the children. That traditional profile only represents about 19 percent of the families in this country.

In 1983 the New York Times conducted a survey which indicated that 71 percent of the women said their primary reason for working was not because they wanted something interesting to do, but rather they had to support their family.

For all too many women, this balancing act has been made extraordinarily difficult by the lack of affordable and available quality day care in this country, as you have suggested, Mr. Chairman. There are 51 million women in the work force—that represents 55 percent of all American women are now in the work force. Some 20 million are mothers with children under the age of 18. Another 8 million have children under the age of 6. Lack of affordable day care in this country is a major factor for women and children remaining in poverty. And 45 percent of non-working, single mothers have indicated that they would be able to go to work if day care was available at a reasonable cost.8

We know that it is an expensive proposition. The fact is child care represents the fourth major factor in overall family expenses. According to the Census Bureau, the American family spends $11 billion on child care in this country. That represents an enormous burden. And the fact is the Federal Government has done little to encourage an increase in the supply of day care in America, has done little to improve upon the existing day care system or to strengthen the regulations which govern child care.

At a time when the United States Government, and particularly the United States Congress, should be increasing and expanding its commitment to child care, the fact is we have reduced it. The majority of working Americans want the government to support policies that would expand the availability, as well as providing affordable day care in this country.

During the 98th Congress I conducted a series of four hearings sponsored by the Joint Economic Committee to address this issue. It became evident at that time that perhaps the single most difficult issue women had to contend with in order to enter the work force or to stay in the work force for any prolonged period of time was child care. That is what led me to introduce the dependent care tax credit that is now one of the provisions included under the family title of the Economic Equity Act.

Briefly, the dependent care tax credit, as I have introduced it, would expand upon the existing tax credit to provide a more realistic level of support for family expenditures on day care. First, it would increase the credit for low income individuals.

Second, it would make the credit refundable so that those individuals whose tax credit exceeds their tax liability would still have full access to the credit.

A third provision would provide support for respite care. One of the other discoveries, of course, has been that 1 out of 10 women in this country between the ages of 45 and 65 years of age has the responsibility for the care of an older family member. Many of these women are forced to curtail their jobs because they cannot fulfill both responsibilities—working as well as taking care of an older member of the family.

That is why I have included in my legislation support and assistance for respite care. This is short-term substitute care in or out of the home to alleviate the physical and emotional demands of providing care on a day-to-day basis. Frankly, in the long run, it will forestall the costly alternative of institutionalization.

When you look beyond the questions of child care and respite care, even if we do address those issues, women still contend with

inequities in the workplace. The fact of the matter is women still do not receive a fair and decent wage. They can work hard for less money, as has been evidenced by the wage gap that it is still apparent in the work force today.

The National Academy of Sciences has indicated that those occupations which are dominated by women will continue to pay less. Women continue to earn less than two-thirds of what men earn in the work force. To me, wages should be based on skills, effort, responsibility, and working conditions demanded by the occupation, rather than on the traditional patterns of historical discrimination.

It is also apparent that occupations are segregated by sex. Of the more than 36 million women employed in non-professional occupations in 1985, 67 percent worked in female dominated occupations. These also happen to be the lowest paid jobs in the country.

In the executive branch, we have discovered that 80 percent of the women working for the Federal Government are concentrated in grades 1 through 7. On the other hand, 85 percent of the men working in the Federal Government are concentrated in grades 10 through 15.

An informal study of the House committee system several years ago also produced interesting evidence: 81 percent of those earning below $20,000 were women. On the other hand, 75 percent of those earning above $40,000 were men.

At this point we have 45 states who have been willing to take steps to evaluate sex-based wage discrimination. Interestingly enough, 17 states have already been willing actually to appropriate funds to eliminate the inequities in their wage systems. The Federal Government, with its infinite capacity for procrastination, has not even studied its own wage system for the last 60 years. The fact is the numerical system in place governing our wage rates has been in place since 1923. I think in that period of time this must be the only issue that has not been studied by the United States Congress.

So, we have two provisions in the Economic Equity Act that begin to address pay equity, one that has been introduced by Congresswoman Oakar, which would establish a commission to examine whether or not wage discrimination exists in the executive branch. Secondly, I have introduced legislation which would establish a commission to examine whether may inequities exist in the legislative branch and to implement a comprehensive system throughout the entire legislative branch. I would think that if we refer to this body as the people's House, then obviously the people who work for the House of Representatives should not be discriminated against.

There are a number of other issues contained in the Economic Equity Act besides dependent care and pay equity. We have spousal impoverishment, pension benefits, access to business credit and a number of other issues.

It seems to me that we know that these are obstacles faced by American women. But women only don't pay the price for these obstacles. All of society is beginning to pay the price for these inequities and these obstacles. And this is a burden that has to be removed from American society.

So, I appreciate the attention that you are giving to these issues, Mr. Chairman. And I applaud your leadership. It seems to me that we have to give recognition, and ultimately we have to take action by the Congress. I think that action on child care is long overdue, and it is an issue that has been ignored in the past by Congress. And until we address this issue—and I think the beginnings of it will certainly come through welfare reform, but we have to much, much more if we want to accord equal status to women in the work place.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[Prepared statement of Hon. Olympia Snowe follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. OLYMPIA J. SNOWE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MAINE

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank you for providing me with the opportunity to testify today. As Co-Chair of the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues, I am very concerned with the many issues affecting the participation of women in the labor force, and I applaud the focus of these hearings.

We must face the fact that there are definite and wideranging obstacles which are preventing American women from reaching full and equal participation in our society. As you know, the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues has introduced the Economic Equity Act of 1987, which addresses many of these obstacles.

The Economic Equity Act is divided into two main titles -- work and family. Balancing the competing needs, demands and interests of work and family are at the center of life for millions of American women -- and to an unprecedented extent, to their employers, employees, husbands and children.

Perhaps the one issue to face all women in their search for economic equity is that of caregiving. For women, providing care for their children, their husbands and their parents has and continues to be a characteristic of their lives. Even as women have taken their place in the labor force as contributors to the economic security of the family, their caregiving responsibilities have not lessened.

With the recent growth in the elderly population, women increasingly have been sandwiched between the competing demands of children and parents, while working and meeting other needs. Once caregiving responsibilities cease for grown children, they accommodate to the needs of parents and/or a sick spouse.

In response to these caregiving situations, women will either

leave the labor force, adjust their hours, or in other ways alter their work experience in order to satisfy family demands. In all of these cases, they do so at the price of their economic security.

One major problem facing today's women is the lack of quality child care. This first became evident to me when I chaired a series of four hearings of the Joint Economic Committee in the 98th Congress on the role of women in the work force. It was an issue of concern then, and, because of what I perceive as inaction on the part of the federal government, is an even more serious problem today.

Currently, over 51 million women, 55% of all American women, are now in the job force. Of this number, 20 million are mothers with children under the age of 18; eight million have children under the age of six. In addition, by 1990, the number of children under age 10 is expected to increase by 14% to 38 million, two-thirds of this growth will be children under the age of six.

According to the Census Bureau, American families spent some $11 billion last year just to care for children under the age of four. This is an enormous burden -- yet the federal government has done little to encourage an increase in the supply of child care facilities, to improve the quality of existing care, or to strengthen standards for child care.

The second title of the Economic Equity Act consists of several proposals to address these recurring problems. I would particularly like to highlight legislation I have introduced to expand the Dependent Care Tax Credit and make it refundable.

The dependent care tax credit is currently available to taxpayers who incur work-related expenses for the care of a child under age 15, a disabled spouse, or any other dependent who is physically or mentally incapable of caring for him or herself. The scale currently allows a 30 percent credit for work-related dependent care expenditures up to $2,400 for taxpayers with incomes of $10,000 or less; the credit is reduced by one percentage point for each $2,000 of income between $10,000 and $28,000 to a minimum of 20 percent.

In order to provide a more realistic level of support to working families to help them meet dependent care expenses, my legislation would raise the sliding scale to 50 percent of dependent care expenditures for families earning $15,000 or less.

The scale would be reduced by one percentage point for each full $1,000 of income, with persons earning $45,000 or more receiving a credit of 20 percent. In addition, the dependent care tax credit would be indexed to the cost of living and made refundable so that those families with incomes too low to have tax liability or whose credit exceeds their tax liability have access to the credit. This will ensure that lower income families have the same access to the credit as the middle and higher income families who currently derive considerable benefit from this tax credit.

The need for adequate elder care is no less pressing than the need for child care. One in ten middle-aged women between 45 and 65 years of age has the responsibility for the care of an older relative. While many of these women continue to participate in the labor force, others retire or curtail their work effort. They do so, for the most part, because they lack the options Page five

necessary to permit them to continue to work and discharge their family responsibilities. Indeed, when caregivers are asked, they consistently indicate their preference for respite care as a preferred service intervention for elderly family members.

For this reason, my legislation would also include respite expenses as a part of the dependent care tax credit. This would provide for a credit of up to $1,200 on respite expenses for one dependent and $2,400 for two dependent individuals. Respite care is the short-term, substitute care provided either in or outside of the home on behalf of the primary caregiver. While these services assist the frail and/or disabled elderly, the principal beneficiary is the caregiver.

A caregiver would be able to either hire someone to come to the home or to care for the dependent for a few hours a day or week, or could bring the dependent to an adult day care center. My legislation would also permit up to a two-week stay in an institution for the dependent family member in order for the caregiver to tend to other personal or family affairs.

The demands of work, family and personal needs, in addition to financial and physical demands can lead to a high level of caregiver strain. Respite care is a crucial break from the constant care of a chronically disabled older person. In the long run, dollars prudently spent on respite care for the Page six

caregiver will save even greater amounts for both families and State and Federal governments by avoiding forced exit from the labor force or the expensive institutionalization of family members.

The dependent care tax credit, and other tax assistance legislation introduced by my colleagues and I, are essential in encouraging the continued involvement of women both in the care of older family members and in the labor force.

Indeed, just yesterday, I introduced legislation which would provide a tax deduction for taxpayers who provide home health, adult day and respite care for a dependent who has Alzheimer's disease or a related disorder. We know that the family that cares for an individual with Alzheimer's spends, on average, 40 hours per week on the personal care needs of that individual. Encouraging respite services assures that families maintain a high level of involvement in the care of those with Alzheimer's.

This continued involvement is essential since we know that families are the most important element in the long-term care system. Families, primarily wives, daughters and daughters-in-law, provide the bulk of care for frail and disabled elderly. Indeed, research has shown that between 80 percent and 90 percent of the medically related care, personal care, household maintenance, transportation and shopping needed by older persons is provided by the family. The presence of a family, principally women family members, is one of the most critical factors in preventing or delaying the need for nursing home care.

There are times, however, when the needs of the elderly can no longer be met in the home. At any period in time, five percent of older persons reside in nursing homes. The financial catastrophe that such placement creates falls most heavily on older women. The expense of nursing home care ranges from $2,000 to $3,000 per month, or more. This can deplete the income of all but the wealthiest. While Medicaid will pay for the care of nursing home residents, it will only do so when all resources have been spent down to a level of about $2,700. The average institutionalized individual spends his resources in about thirteen weeks.

The consequence of the "spend down" provision is to leave the spouse in the community with very limited resources. Often, after years of hard work, the community spouse will become dependent on public welfare programs because all assets have been used. Income follows the individual in whose name the check is

written. Often a women will be completely dependent on her husband's social security and retirement income because she worked in the home or worked parttime and does not receive these benefits herself. In these circumstances, all of her husband's income goes to pay for nursing home care leaving her as little as $340 per month on which to live -- that is the SSI minimum monthly needs allowance.

The inclusion of legislation to address this devastating scenario was essential in the crafting of the Economic Equity Act. In almost no situation was the interrelationship between economic security and long-term care more obvious. I am pleased to say that I was the author of one of the bills to address spousal impoverishment.

I proposed applying the concept of community property to the division of income and assets because I believe it is a fair way of allocating resources among individuals who, each in their own way, have contributed to the family unit. For many women the contribution has been either through unpaid work in the home or in employment that has brought a lower wage. Yet each family member has contributed in his or her own way, for which neither one should be penalized.

I am pleased to say that language from my legislation has been included in catastrophic health legislation that will come to the floor this week for consideration. The recognition of the need to address the economic situation of women who have been impoverished as a result of the institutionalization of their spouse is an important step in providing economic security for all older women.

Another important issue addressed in the Economic Equity Act is that of pay cquity. The concept of pay equity recognizes simply that discrimination exists not only when people are paid differently for doing the same work but when they are paid differently by their employer for work of equal value.

The wage gap between men and women has remained virtually constant in recent years, with women continuing to earn less than two-thirds the wages paid to men. And, of the more than 36 million women employed in non-professional occupations in 1985, 67% worked in female-dominated jobs - jobs that are among the lowest paid in our society. And the pay they receive appears to have far less to do with the actual work they do than with the fact that they are women.

At the present time, twenty-eight states have either completed or are in the process of completing studies of discriminatory wage-setting policies. And, 17 states have actually appropriated funds to eliminate the pay inequities that had been identified. Over 100 state and local governments have undertaken pay equity initiatives, with successful outcomes.

The Economic Equity Act includes legislation I have introduced that would address this issue here in Congress. It would establish a bipartisan Commission to identify the existence of discriminatory wage-setting and personnel policies within the legislative branch as a whole, and the Library of Congress specifically. This Commissiton would then develop a comprehensive plan for eliminiating these inequities.

Sex-based wage discrimination is certainly a major factor preventing women from reaching their full economic potential and therefore economic security. It is only fitting that the Economic Equity Act recognizes this obstacle.

I am pleased that these hearings are looking closely at the many problems facing women in the work force. It is my hope that as we address the many obstacles hindering the productivity of virtually half our workforce, we will move a step closer to the achievement of equal participation of women in our society.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Congresswoman Snowe.

Let me ask you a question, because over and over as we debate this situation, I keep hearing the same thing from a few—hopefully it is a few and hopefully we will be able to even convince them if we need enough votes—that child care is something that many middle class American families can afford where husband and wife both work. These people believe these families are somehow able to provide for their own child care and why should the government get involved in providing something?

And I remember specifically at last week's markup on the welfare reform package one particular individual remarking that it would be ridiculous to provide day care for a 13 or 14 year old, that they are not going to go to that anyway. It shows the limited view that some people have of the real situation out there.

It should have been apparent to that individual, as astute as he is, that there are latchkey programs all over the United States where children through the 9th grade—I think 13 is the maximum on that program, but what is the difference of one year—are provided forms of day care. And they are not necessarily day care centers that you think of in conjunction with 5 year olds or less or even 6 year olds.

These programs help these young people in different ways, in counseling or tutoring in a subject that they might be short on. There is a multitude of benefits to these programs. And these people welcome these programs. And the Federal Government put some seed money in, but a lot of it is done on a voluntary basis.

But how do we get across to these people that even though there are many middle class Americans that are providing child care, maybe through family arrangements because they have the availability of family that there are many women, not only welfare recipients, that need some assistance in providing day care so that they can get out and be productive. That in the long run it is going to pay us back anyway?

Ms. SNOWE. Well, I know the statistics would be very convincing and persuasive in terms of the available child care slots in this country and the need to provide for additional slots. There are so many children, teenagers, as you mentioned, and younger children, who are in need of day care. Their families need to provide day care, but the slots do not exist. So, there are statistics that are so compelling that would show and demonstrate that there is a need to provide day care for middle income families, and certainly for low income families, because day care is so expensive even when it is available that there is no way that a lot of middle income families could support it. And obviously low income families cannot. Day care cost can go from anywhere on an annual basis of $3,000 to $10,000 a year depending on what is available in a community. Many of rural areas in the second district of Maine have very little in the way of child care, and when it is available, obviously it is expensive and many cannot afford it. The statistics demonstrate it.

There are 7 million latchkey children in this country of all ages. It seems to me that we have a responsibility to them. If we want to strengthen the family unit, this is one area in which we can do it. I do not think there is anything worse for a young child 13 or 14 to go home at the end of the day and to be alone. They need a place

to go, and I think we have a responsibility in recognizing the changing dynamics in the work place that affect men and women and children. Therefore, if we are going to strengthen the family, I think this is one area in which we can do it. The statistics are so strong in this area that I think it would be convincing to demonstrate that there is a necessity for providing additional care.

The fact is, the overwhelming majority of American people think the government should do more in this regard.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Let me ask you on a little bit different subject but really pertaining to the same thing, the archaic thinking that exists in some people's minds that if we try to bring about equity for people it is somehow a divisive kind of mechanism, that somehow if we provide this equity for women, that they will flock to the workplace and forget about families. Thus it destroys and erodes the family concept.

I happen to be one who has five married children and all spouses on either side work. And they have families. And hey, they are good, strong family units. So, I do not believe that.

But somehow some people develop those ideas. Would you comment? Where do we get decisive statistics to repel this idea?

Ms. SNOWE. Well, I certainly could provide, and certainly the Caucus could provide, I think enough statistics to dismiss that argument. It certainly is archaic.

As I indicated, in the New York Times survey—and I am sure there are more recent surveys which would suggest that a lot of women are compelled to go into the workforce to support their families. Many of them are single heads of household, and they find themselves in poverty. The fact is that the fastest growing poverty group in the country, is female, single heads of household taking care of children. So, it is not a question out of choice or improving their day-to-day interests. The issue is that they have to go to work.

I do not think it is divisive. I think women have the same right to be entitled to improve themselves personally and professionally as do men in society. So, even if it is a choice, that should be their choice and they are entitled to that choice to be able to expand their careers and to do something that would enhance their own confidence and self-esteem and obviously improve their standard of living and to support their children because many women find themselves in that predicament.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HAWKINS. Certainly, Ms. Snowe, I would like to congratulate you on your leadership in this field.

I have only one question. Would you explain how the tax credit that you propose would help women who have no tax liability, who are exempt or whose earnings are so low that they have no tax liability? In what way will they be helped?

Ms. SNOWE. First of all, my dependent care tax credit has been adjusted to comply with the new tax reform proposal because a number of low income individuals were taken off the tax rolls. So, we had to make adjustments in increasing the tax credit from 30 percent to 50 percent for those who earn $15,000 or less and pay taxes.

For those whose tax credit exceeds their tax liability, we would make it refundable. In other words, if someone is entitled to a $500 tax credit because of their expenses, it would be refunded to them by the United States Government. They would actually receive the money because obviously there is no way to benefit from the tax credit if they are not paying any taxes.

Mr. HAWKINS. But if they have no tax liability, how would you refund that which they do not have?

Ms. SNOWE. Again, as I have said, it would be returned. If they are paying X amount of dollars in the form of day care, and let's say $500, they are entitled to it. I mean, it is a credit on your tax return. But since they do not have tax liability in which they can write that off, then the government would return the amount in the form of a check to them.

Mr. HAWKINS. You would fix a scale——

Ms. SNOWE. It would be like the earned income tax credit.

Mr. HAWKINS [continuing]. Based on what they actually expend in child care.

Ms. SNOWE. For 50 percent of their expenses.

Mr. HAWKINS. The national average is in somewhere in excess of $3,000. Now, would they then get $3,000?

Ms. SNOWE. We give 50 percent of their costs.

Mr. HAWKINS. Of the actual cost.

Ms. SNOWE. Right.

It is already an existing law. And what my bill proposes to do is to expand the percentage to 50 percent for those on the lower scales. We have taken off a lot of people from the tax rolls already. So, on the tax credit aspect, it would be for those——

Mr. HAWKINS. Do you have any idea how much that would cost?

Ms. SNOWE. Yes. My bill overall would cost $1.3 billion.

Mr. HAWKINS. That's $1.3 billion overall.

Thank you.

Ms. SNOWE. Thank you.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Gunderson.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It is a unique privilege for me to welcome to our subcommittee a very dear and special friend who I worked with so closely on so many issues and congratulate her not only for her leadership on a number of the issues that she has included within the Economic Equity Act, but in many other areas as well.

I want to ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that I might insert a more complete statement in this regard into the record at this point in time.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Without objection, so ordered.

[Prepared statement of Hon. Steve Gunderson follows:]

Prepared Statement of Hon. Steve Gunderson, a Representative in Congress From the State of Wisconsin

Mr. Chairman, I commend you for holding these hearings so that our Subcommittee may identify and begin to address the concerns and challenges confronting women in today's workforce. At a time when we anticipate that by the year 2000, approximately 47 percent of the workforce will be women, with 61 percent of all women employed, we must take into account the very special needs of this population, particularly for those who have the double role of worker and mother.

Current projections estimate that women will comprise about 3/5 of the new entrants into the labor force between 1985 and 2000, with much of this increase coming from increased participation by women with children. Statistics show that of the 14.6 million married women who joined the labor force between 1960 and 1984, 8 million came from families with children, with the proportion of married mothers at work growing from 28 to 61 percent. And, the share of all children under 6 whose mothers work grew from 19 to 52 percent.

We can no longer shut our eyes to the real concerns and needs of this population, from both an economic and human vantage point. Unfortunately, many of the policies governing the workforce which were designed during an era of male breadwinners and female homemakers continue to be practiced in today's workplace. To say the least, these are now unrealistic. And, as we continue to see more women working, whether as a result of societal or economic changes, we must find ways to accomodate their families' special needs.

To be truly successful, these concerns must be addressed through the combined efforts of government, private interest groups, and business. Hearings such as these provide us with a first step to identify government's role in providing assistance, guidance, and encouragement to the private sector to realistically meet the needs of its workers, as well as to define where we can be of most assistance. Rather than government being the sole provider of assistance, or dictator to business in the development and initiation of these new policies and programs, we must act as innovative facilitator, providing encouragement and leadership as we move into the year 2000. If we are to retain our competitive edge in the world marketplace, the United States must recognize that nearly half of our workforce today is comprised of women and that these workers must be treated fairly in terms of equitable pay, fringe benefits, time away from work and flexible working hours, pensions, and child care, to name only a few areas of concern.

At this time I want to extend a very special welcome to the gentlewoman from Maine, Representative Snowe, and to thank her for joining us this morning. Your insight as co-chairperson of the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues and as a Member on the Select Committee on Aging is valued and places you in a position to provide leadership to the Congress in such important issues as these we are dealing with today. In addition to legislative initiatives which fall directly under the jurisdiction of this Committee, you have introduced several measures in related areas such as spousal impoverishment and respite care, which while not necessarily gender specific, affect the worklives of women, young and old alike.

Representative Snowe's Medicare Community Property and Respite Care legislation (H.R. 2131) establishes a balanced mechanism to maintain the economic security of a "community spouse," [generally a woman] while providing, when financially necessary, long-term nursing home care for his/his spouse through Medicaid.

The basic theory underlying community property is that both spouses contribute equally to the property [assets/income] acquired during their married years, and should, therefore, share equally in the ownership of any interest resulting from their joint efforts.

Since January 1, 1986, the principle of community property has been at work in my home state of Wisconsin. H.R. 2131, like Wisconsin's marital property reform law, considers the assets and income of married persons to be joint resources divisible by two. Thus, half of a couple's assets, income and resources remain with the community spouse, and the remaining portion is to begin covering the expenses of the nursing home spouse.

At a series of four regional forums held throughout Wisconsin's Third District on the issue of Medicare catastrophic health care coverage, I made an interesting observation. The issue of spousal impoverishment continually surfaced as a concern of the Medicare population, and was always raised by a woman. A community spouse should no longer fear impoverishment when her spouse enters a nursing facility. H.R. 2131 moves us responsibly in that direction.

[3]

On the eve of House consideration of H.R. 2941, the Medicare Catastrophic Protection Act, it is appropriate to note that community property, as outlined in H.R. 2131, is a vital element of this Medicare package. Incorporation of Representative Snowe's community property legislation into the Medicare Catastrophic Protection Act reflects on one hand our commitment to provide necessary nursing care to one spouse while on the other hand assisting the "community spouse" to remain in their community, preserving their dignity, independence, and financial security. It is a pleasure to join as a cosponsor of this equitable community property legislation, one element of the 1987 Economic Equity Act [H.R. 2577].

Caregiving and respite care are two important issues, closely associated with women, that will continue to command greater attention as our society ages and as women increasingly account for a larger share of our workforce. By the turn of the century, estimates indicate that 61 percent of American women will work, and will hold 47 percent of the occupations in our workforce. Others will explore educational opportunities, joining our growing population of non-traditional students. While there clearly are positive effects of a greater participation of women in our workforce and educational system, economically and socially, we must address how such shifts, or changing demands, will affect the delivery of child care, caregiver, and respite care services.

[4]

Two recent newspaper articles ["Firms Begin Support for Workers Who Look After Elder Relatives," The Wall Street Journal, 6 July 1987; "Coping With Careers and 'Elder Care'," The Washington Post, 19 July 1987] clearly illustrate the need for the public sector to work with the private sector in an effort to pull together our patchwork of programs responding to our workforce needs in the area of child care, caregivers and respite care. It is evident that without viable solutions to assist employees in properly meeting their familial caregiving roles there will continue to be an economic drain on our workforce and families. As our workforce becomes more service and information oriented and technologically advanced, it will cause a greater economic strain for employees who are faced with the situation of relinquishing their job in order to meet caregiver responsibilities. Employers in this scenario are also faced with a hardship of replacing and retraining competent employees.

The need for compassionate and proper responses for the delivery of caregiver services and respite care will only continue grow as our society ages, thus it is important to focus on an economically feasible answers for our expanding workforce. The extraordinary efforts of the gentlewoman from Maine in responding to these complex issues are commendable and deserving of greater attention in the formation of future employment policy as our populace ages and we head into the year 2000.

I would like to conclude by restating in the areas of child care, caregiver services, and respite care, and in the areas of flexible working conditions, equitable pay and pension benefits, we must move from narrow workplace policies offering limited ranges of personal choices to a mutiple-option society. Both the private and public sectors must address and expand the economic alternatives and options available to women and men alike in an effort to bridge their familial responsibilities and their careers.

Again I commend you Mr. Chairman for holding these hearings, and I look forward to the testimony of this morning's witnesses.

Mr. GUNDERSON. And Olympia, I would like to ask you a more general question. I think one of the frustrations that I feel at times, and I suspect that the Chairman of this subcommittee feels at times as well, is that as we look at the Economic Equity Act and we look at the various provisions which have combined to form this legislation, we have the frustration that most of these bills are referred to different committees all over the Congress. And I am not sure, to be honest, if we have the actual jurisdiction over any of these particular bills in this subcommittee. I am not critical of the Chairman because I think the frustration we feel is that there is no committee that has the authority to look at the big picture.

You can take child care, for example. This Congress has nothing but a hodgepodge of legislation on child care because of the fact that no one committee has a broad enough jurisdiction to deal with the issue and come up with a coordinated program.

What I am asking from you I guess is what can we do in the subcommittee that can provide the assistance to you and others to deal with some of these issues? I mean, oversight hearings are a nice discussion. It is sort of like the preacher talking to the choir, however.

Ms. SNOWE. Well, first of all, there are probably some of these issues—and again, I would have to go through them—in the Economic Equity Act that would be referred to your committee. But you are right. When it comes to child care, at least insofar as my legislation is concerned, obviously it would go to the Ways and Means Committee. There are some other child care provisions in this act which I think would be referred to your committee.

But many of them—obviously, it's going to require funding. And that is also an issue for us in Congress. Frankly, I think that although we would be required to spend a considerable amount of money on child care, that may be a short-term loss, but I think it is going to be a long-term gain in any event.

Certainly, if we are talking about welfare reform, we have to spend some money to make a difference for people to get off welfare. There is no way you can expect individuals to get off welfare, earn the minimum wage and yet finance transportation, child care and their medical benefits which are terminated once they begin to work full-time.

So, that is why welfare reform in my opinion is essential. And although it is going to be costly at the beginning, I think ultimately we will assist women in becoming self-sufficient and independent.

To get to the crux of your question, I think that these oversight hearings are valuable because they do draw attention to the issue. I think if there are any of these bills which have been referred to your committee, I hope your committee can consider them.

I think raising the issue of child care with members of the Ways and Means Committee is absolutely important because I am afraid that we are going to adjust child care to a certain extent in welfare reform, but we are going to stop there, and we are not going to do much more. And certainly much more needs to be done to assist not only low income, but middle income individuals. Our first target obviously has to be the low income individuals who happen to be on welfare as well.

So, we need to draw more attention to this issue all the way around. I think that this hearing serves a very good purpose. But we have to contact other individuals who are in a position in chairing committees that have responsibility on some of these provisions to address them as well.

Mr. GUNDERSON. One of the issues of concern I brought up yesterday to Congresswoman Schroeder, which I know you share with me, is the problem that when we are looking at child care thus far, we are looking at it only from a means tested basis as to eligibility for government assistance.

I think there is also a geographic basis or accessibility basis that needs to be included as well because one of the biggest problems we find in rural western Wisconsin, when we talk about economic development and we talk about the opportunity for the farm wife or the woman even in the small town to leave the home and go to work, is even the availability of child care. It just does not exist in rural America. We have not come up with a system to do it. Probably we are going to have to come up with an REA loan program or something for child care.

I want to change just a second because one of the issues in the Economic Equity Act and an issue that you have been dealing with is an issue that probably will be successful, at least on the House side, over the next 24 hours. That is spousal impoverishment. Do you want to comment on that? I think both the proposals in front of us deal with that issue, don't they?

Ms. SNOWE. Yes. The fact is both the committee bill and the Republican initiative contain the spousal impoverishment initiative. Some of the suggestions I made in the legislation I introduced on this issue, are very important for women—women traditionally, the wife, but not in all cases. Obviously, one spouse has to diminish their resources to a poverty level in order to be eligible for Medicaid when their spouse needs to have nursing home assistance. So, I think that spousal impoverishment legislation is absolutely essential.

I am pleased that the committee also included a 50–50 division of community property. That was a provision I had included in my spousal impoverishment legislation so that the remaining spouse is entitled to at least 50 percent of the assets and does not lose everything in the process of having to spend down to the Medicaid eligibility level.

I am pleased that both the committee and the Republican initiative recognize the importance of spousal impoverishment, so that we do not diminish people in the process of trying to get some long-term care, which is obviously an issue that we will ultimately have to address in greater substance. But certainly, that is a step in the right direction.

Generally, this affects women more, and they lose all of their assets because they have to spend down in the process of trying to get eligibility for their spouse. It happens to be women, but obviously it can be the reverse.

Mr. HAWKINS. Sure. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Mr. Gunderson.

Mr. Owens.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I have no questions. I would just like to congratulate Congresswoman Snowe and the members of the Congressional Caucus on Women's Issues. I think you have made a tremendous contribution in this area. And if I have further questions, I know where to find you.

Ms. SNOWE. Thank you. I appreciate your comments.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Hayes?

Mr. HAYES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to join with you and my other colleagues here on the committee in commending Congresswoman Snowe for her introduction of legislation in regards to the matter which is before us.

I have learned during my time in Congress that you do not question or converse too much with those that are already converted.

Ms. SNOWE. That is right.

Mr. HAYES. You spend the time with those who have not yet reached that point. Thank you very much.

Ms. SNOWE. I appreciate your well-taken statement.

I would also add that 107 members of the House have co-sponsored this legislation. So, I think that that is a step in the right direction. We need to get more support. But I think that is a strong commitment on the part of a number of members. And obviously we hope to be successful in this Congress.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Congresswoman Snowe.

Before you depart, let me suggest that maybe we ought to get those that are co-sponsors of the bill to talk to some of their colleagues in getting more co-sponsors. We should go to the floor with this thing with about 435 co-sponsors.

Ms. SNOWE. That would be great. Probably not possible.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Well, thank you very much for your testimony this morning.

Ms. SNOWE. Thank you.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Our first panel consists of Dr. Evelyn Handler, President of Brandeis University, Waltham, Massachusetts; also the Honorable Elizabeth Holtzman, District Attorney, Kings County, Brooklyn, New York; and Ms. Irene Lee on behalf of the National Institute for Women of Color. I welcome you three and we will begin with Dr. Handler.

STATEMENT OF DR. EVELYN HANDLER, PRESIDENT, BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY, WALTHAM, MA

Dr. HANDLER. Good morning. I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Chairman Martinez, to you, sir, and to the members of this committee for the invitation to speak to you on the topic of working women.

And as President of Brandeis University, I choose to approach this topic not from my personal perspective as a working woman, but really from the personal vantage point of a college administrator who is extraordinarily alarmed at the declining numbers of minorities and specifically also minority women—and I think I will concentrate on black women today—on our college campuses.

As far as I am concerned, the under-education of minorities is a topic which clearly affects women and is not a problem relegated to the minority community alone. Indeed, with the demographic data

showing minorities growing at a faster rate than whites, declining enrollment in our four year programs becomes an issue of national concern because it portends a future loss of one of the country's greatest resources, its brainpower.

Now, I have prepared for your consideration a rather voluminous text which documents the decline of minorities on our campuses, some of the causes therefor, and I would like to address that issue with you in a very personal way. I would hope that you would accept this testimony, sir, put it into the minutes. And I hope it will be of use to your staff and to yourselves at some future time in terms of legislation under consideration and future legislation.

But I believe firmly that a problem which I became involved with when I was on the faculty of Hunter College in the late 1960s and early 1970s, a problem which I continued to address when I became dean of sciences at Hunter, and a problem which we face at both public and private institutions today, is one that is so close to my heart that I can speak to you directly and hope that there are points that I will make that you can address and resonate to.

When I first went to Hunter College, it was an all-female institution which had a considerable number of blacks and minorities because black and minorities entered it through the usual process of examinations and achievements. And there were many in New York City who could so achieve.

With the advent of the SEEK program and open admissions, the numbers of minorities who were given such opportunities increased, as was the opportunity for others who could not get in in the normal route in years passed.

By 1969, 1970, the numbers of minorities at Hunter College had increased to approximately 50 percent of the student body. And it was evident early on that they were under-prepared, but they were there. And it was our job to create a program for them that would enable them to succeed and succeed they did.

I was given the privilege of developing a biology program because, as you will note by my vita, I am a biologist. I taught a program for them that enabled those under-prepared students to prepare themselves and to succeed in the regular four year program.

I continued that interest, and when I became dean of sciences and mathematics at Hunter, aspects of the lack of presence of minorities in the sciences became even more evident. And with the Federal Government's aid and through MBS program and MARC programs that we put into place at Hunter College, the number of students in undergraduate sciences and graduate training of minorities increased. And the city university continues to thrive and to perform the appropriate function that it has for those minorities.

But if we look across the college campuses in this country since the 1970s, we see that instead of 44 percent of high school graduates who are minorities entering the college campuses, that number has dropped to 38 percent. We note that 60 percent of those students are in two year programs. And we note even further that the number is declining black youth in particular, but minorities in general, are discouraged and feel that American higher education is not receiving them well, not doing right by them, not making a hospitable environment available to them. And I think

all campuses can be considered wanting in doing that which needs to be done.

We have become aroused in recent months and weeks about some of the incidents on our campuses. And those of us who hopefully are college administrators have begun to address the issues seriously and with a desire to do something. Obviously, for many college youth and especially minority women, the system fails them because it appears to them that they are in a double whammy. They are not at home on the campuses because there are not enough of them. There are not enough roll models on the campuses because we lack the staff who are trained and people on our faculties who would act as roll models.

We need to create an environment, and we need to start early. But it is something else that we have to address, that we need to do as well. We have to educate minority youth early to make them believe that the system can, indeed, work for them and that education is the way up and out of the poverty route. Education at every level. But if this country is going to have the work force and the brainpower available to it from its own society, it will have to tap that large, emerging minority society which has growing much faster than the white component that we currently are tracking.

How do we start? Which are the programs which have succeeded and which the Federal Government has been involved with? You know them. The Headstart programs were some of the most effective programs that this government has ever put into place and supported. Headstart continues but there is not enough of it. And the support structure that must be created for students must not end with the Headstart program.

The critical years of the elementary school, and most especially the junior high school, must be attended to. The mentoring that begins in Headstart must continue into the elementary schools and the junior high schools when young people are at an extremely impressionable age and when the culture that they are on a daily basis, the culture of poverty, of drugs, of neglect, of working mothers, of lack of day care—you talked about day care with Congressperson Snowe.

Day care does not involve baby-sitting. Day care is continued education. Students in elementary schools could be given in day care programs continue education. Students can be provided with continuing education and mentoring in the junior high schools.

A program which we are now managing at Brandeis University called "Career Beginnings" is an example of a successful program that identifies students in the junior and senior year of high school, not high achievers, but students who achieve at a modest level and at an average level, who are encouraged to pursue and do better through a program in partnership with private industry.

Mentors, who are people in the community, meet with students on a monthly basis and promote their interest in education, give them confidence, give them a desire and show them that "whitey's system" can work for them.

To convince young people who are turned off by the systems for all the reasons that you know they are turned off, we must develop a way of providing summer jobs as Career Beginnings does, of innovative mentoring as Career Beginnings does and showing them the

way into junior college, four year institutions and ultimately to provide them the training which would permit them to enter the technological and other work forces.

I will summarize by saying that I deem this a high priority item for the Congress. A question asked also of Congressperson Snowe is how do you convince the non-believer rather than preaching to the believer—it is really very simple. It is enlightened self-interest. If this Nation will remain competitive in the years ahead, it will do so only if it utilizes fully the tremendous resource that is available in the people. That resource is available in women. It is available in minorities. And it is available in the population at large. But what I see is the gap becoming greater and greater and greater.

And despite the fact that many of us have spoken out, very few of us have been willing to take the action necessary to bring the communities together, express our strong desire to the community that is lacking, that there is help out there, and to provide it.

Thank you very much.

[Prepared statement of Evelyn E. Handler follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF EVELYN E. HANDLER, PRESIDENT, BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY, WALTHAM, MASSACHUSETTS

GOOD MORNING. I AM HONORED TO HAVE THIS OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK TO YOU TODAY AND WOULD LIKE TO EXPRESS MY APPRECIATION TO CHAIRMAN MARTINEZ AND THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR FOR INVITING ME TO TESTIFY ON BEHALF OF WORKING WOMEN.

AS PRESIDENT OF BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY, I CHOSE TO APPROACH THIS TOPIC NOT FROM THE PERSONAL PERSPECTIVE OF A WORKING WOMAN, BUT FROM THE PROFESSIONAL VANTAGE POINT OF A COLLEGE ADMINISTRATOR. AS SUCH, I'D LIKE TO TALK TODAY ABOUT AN ISSUE OF NATIONAL IMPORTANCE: THE STEADY AND ALARMING DECLINE OF MINORITY STUDENTS ON AMERICA'S CAMPUSES -- PARTICULARLY BLACK STUDENTS -- AND THE IMPLICATIONS OF THAT DECLINE ON THE FUTURE ECONOMY.

THE UNDEREDUCATION OF MINORITIES IS A TOPIC WHICH CLEARLY AFFECTS BOTH MEN AND WOMEN, AND IS NOT A PROBLEM RELEGATED TO THE MINORITY COMMUNITY ALONE. INDEED, WITH DEMOGRAPHIC DATA SHOWING MINORITIES GROWING AT A FASTER RATE THAN WHITES, DECLINING ENROLLMENT IN FOUR YEAR PROGRAMS BECOMES AN ISSUE OF NATIONAL CONCERN BECAUSE IT PORTENDS A FUTURE LOSS OF OF ONE OF THIS COUNTRY'S GREATEST RESOURCES, ITS BRAIN POWER.

IT IS MY CONTENTION THAT EDUCATING MINORITY STUDENTS IS CRITICAL TO CORRECTING THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL RAMIFICATIONS OF RACISM, AND ENSURING THE FUTURE STABILITY OF THIS COUNTRY. YET, MORE AND MORE MINORITY STUDENTS ARE TURNING AWAY FROM THE COLLEGE

TRACT. WHETHER IT IS LACK OF MONEY, GUIDANCE OR SELF ESTEEM, AN INCREASING NUMBER OF MINORITY AMERICANS ARE CHOOSING THE LABOR FORCE AND MILITARY OVER A BACCALAUREATE DEGREE.

THERE ARE FEEDER PROGRAMS IN EXISTENCE NOW THAT ARE TRACKING PROMISING MINORITY STUDENTS INTO HIGHER EDUCATION. I WILL DISCUSS ONE SUCH PROGRAM, CALLED CAREER BEGINNINGS, WHICH HAS EXPERIENCED LIMITED SUCCESS AND IS IN NEED OF GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE IN ORDER TO EXPAND.

IN DISCUSSING THE PROBLEM OF DECLINING ENROLLMENT I AM GOING TO FOCUS ON THE SPECIFIC ISSUES FACING BLACK STUDENTS, BECAUSE IT IS HERE WHERE THE SHARPEST DROP IN COLLEGE ENROLLMENT IS BEING FELT. AND WHILE THE BARRIERS TO HIGHER EDUCATION FACING BLACK AMERICANS ARE FORMIDABLE, I BELIEVE THE PROBLEM IS PARTICULARLY ACUTE FOR BLACK WOMEN.

INDEED, MANY BLACK WOMEN CONSIDER THEIR SEX AND RACE TO BE TWO STRIKES AGAINST THEM. AND THOUGH THE AFFIRMATIVE ACTION MOVEMENT OF THE '60S HELPED TO PROPEL BLACK AMERICANS FORWARD, PROVIDING OPPORTUNITIES THAT WERE PREVIOUSLY BEYOND REACH FOR MANY, IT SHOULD NOT BE OVERLOOKED THAT TODAY MORE BLACK WOMEN WORK IN SERVICE POSITIONS, SUCH AS DOMESTIC WORK, THAN IN ANY OTHER OCCUPATION.

THE LOW EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF BLACK WOMEN IS REFLECTED IN ANNUAL

MEDIAN INCOME FIGURES. IT IS ESTIMATED THAT BLACK WOMEN AGE 25 AND OLDER WITH A HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION EARN ON THE AVERAGE 8,000 DOLLARS A YEAR. ADD TO THIS SITUATION THE FACT THAT HALF OF ALL DISADVANTAGED BLACK CHILDREN ARE BROUGHT UP ALONE BY THEIR MOTHERS, IN SITUATIONS WHERE INADEQUATE NUTRITION AND HEALTH CARE PREVAIL; IN NEIGHBORHOODS WHERE DRUG ABUSE IS RISING AND WHERE FOUR OF EVERY 10 GIRLS ARE PREGNANT BEFORE THEY REACH 20. IN THIS ENVIRONMENT, ACADEMIC MOTIVATION AND SCHOLASTIC SUCCESS ARE TOO FREQUENTLY REGARDED AS FOREIGN CONCEPTS.

ALTHOUGH STATISTICS REFLECT SOME PROGRESS IN BLACK STUDENT ENROLLMENT SINCE THE EARLY '60S -- WITH BLACK WOMEN REPRESENTING MORE THAN 50 PERCENT OF ALL BLACK MATRICULANTS IN FOUR-YEAR PROGRAMS -- OVERALL THEY REPRESENT A DECLINE FROM THE PEAK PERIOD IN 1975 AND '76.

WHAT MAKES THIS DROP PARTICULARLY SIGNIFICANT IS THAT THE NUMBER OF MINORITY STUDENTS GRADUATING FROM HIGH SCHOOL IS AT AN ALL-TIME HIGH.

STATISTICS COMPILED BY THE BUREAU OF CENSUS REVEAL THAT 55 PERCENT (586,000) OF BLACK AMERICAN 18- AND 19-YEAR-OLDS GRADUATED FROM HIGH SCHOOL IN 1978 WITH 46 PERCENT OF THAT FIGURE (270,000) GOING ON TO COLLEGE. IN 1984, 63 PERCENT OF THAT AGE GROUP (688,000) GRADUATED FROM HIGH SCHOOL YET ONLY 38 PERCENT (265,000) ENTERED COLLEGE.

COMPARE THOSE FIGURES TO THE WHITE POPULATION, IN WHICH 76 PERCENT (5,391,000) OF ALL 18- AND 19-YEAR-OLDS GRADUATED FROM HIGH SCHOOL IN 1978 WITH 48 PERCENT (2,553,000) ENTERING COLLEGE. IN 1984, 75 PERCENT (4,632,000) OF WHITE AMERICANS IN THAT AGE GROUP GRADUATED FROM HIGH SCHOOL, AND 55 PERCENT (2,541,000) ENROLLED IN COLLEGE.

I SHOULD ALSO POINT OUT THAT APPROXIMATELY 55 PERCENT OF ALL BLACK STUDENT ENROLLMENT FIGURES ARE IN TWO-YEAR COLLEGES. IN TOTAL, NEARLY TWO-THIRDS OF THE BLACK FRESHMEN CLASS ARE PURSUING ASSOCIATE DEGREES.

THERE ARE MANY FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO THE DISPROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION OF BLACK STUDENTS IN FOUR-YEAR PROGRAMS. RISING TUITION COSTS, COUPLED WITH A REDUCTION IN GRANTS TO LESS THAN HALF OF THE AID PACKAGE AND A 50 PERCENT INCREASE IN STUDENT LOANS, CAN BE CITED AS ONE EXAMPLE.

INDEED AS SOLOMON ARBEITER, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AT THE COLLEGE BOARD, POINTS OUT, "A DEBT LOAD OF UP TO 10,000 DOLLARS AT THE CONCLUSION OF A FOUR-YEAR DEGREE PROGRAM CAN PROVE A VERY STRONG DETERRENT TO SOMEONE WHOSE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME IS [ABOUT] HALF THAT AMOUNT."

WITH THE AVAILABILITY OF PELL GRANTS, STATE AID AND WORK-STUDY

PROGRAMS, ONE CAN ARGUE THAT FINANCIAL AID IS STILL AVAILABLE FOR THE TRULY NEEDY. YET IF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES ARE PERCEIVED AS PRICED-BEYOND-REACH ENTITIES, THAN THE IMPACT RISING TUITION COSTS HAVE ON THESE YOUNG PEOPLE CAN BE NOTHING LESS THAN DETRIMENTAL.

ONE 18-YEAR-OLD EXPLAINS HER REASON FOR JOINING THE ARMY AFTER GRADUATION IN A RECENT NEW YORK TIMES ARTICLE. SHE SAYS:

> "THE GUIDANCE COUNSELORS TELL US THERE'S FINANCIAL AID AND OTHER HELP, BUT WE KNOW NOBODY'S EVER HELPED US BEFORE. ONCE YOU START HEARING THOSE NUMBERS, LIKE THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS, MOST OF US JUST SAY FORGET IT."

ALSO AGGRAVATING THE NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARDS HIGHER EDUCATION AMONG BLACK YOUTHS, IS AN INCREASE IN RACIAL TENSIONS BEING REPORTED ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES. IN ONE SUCH INCIDENT, APPROXIMATELY 3,000 STUDENTS WERE INVOLVED IN A BRAWL THAT LEFT 10 PEOPLE INJURED, INCLUDING A BLACK STUDENT WHO WAS BEATEN UNCONSCIOUS.

THE FEELING AMONG BLACKS THESE DAYS IS THAT THEY ARE NO LONGER WELCOME ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES. THIS MAY EXPLAIN WHY SOME BLACK YOUNG PEOPLE REGARD ACADEMIC SUCCESS AS SOCIALLY UNACCEPTABLE. AS ONE BLACK STUDENT PUT IT, STUDYING FOR EXAMS AND DOING WELL IN COURSES IS "WHITEY'S WAY."

THAT A GENERATION OF YOUNG PEOPLE ARE DEFINING THEMSELVES IN DIRECT OPPOSITION TO THEIR PERCEPTION OF THE WHITE CULTURE IS ONE OF THE MOST HARMFUL COMPONENTS IN THE DECLINING ENROLLMENT PROBLEM. THE RAMIFICATIONS OF SUCH A DEFENSIVE POSTURE IS ESPECIALLY TROUBLESOME IN LIGHT OF THE U.S. LABOR DEPARTMENT STATISTICS, WHICH REVEAL THAT A BACHELOR'S DEGREE IS JUST ABOUT THE MOST EFFECTIVE TOOL IN THWARTING THE ECONOMIC REPERCUSSIONS OF RACISM.

AND SINCE THE NUMBER OF BLACK STUDENTS IN FOUR-YEAR PROGRAMS IS DECREASING, SO TOO IS THEIR PRESENCE IN GRADUATE SCHOOLS. THE NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATIONAL STATISTICS ESTIMATES THAT BLACKS MAKE UP FEWER THAN FIVE (4.8) PERCENT OF ALL U.S. GRADUATE SCHOOL ENROLLMENTS.

OF THE NEARLY 281,000 MASTER'S DEGREES AWARDED IN 1982 AND '83, ONLY FIVE PERCENT WENT TO BLACKS. SIMILARLY, OF THE MORE THAN 29,000 DOCTORATES AWARDED THAT SAME YEAR, ONLY FOUR PERCENT WERE RECEIVED BY BLACKS.

AS A PERCENTAGE, THAT FIGURE IS DAMNING ENOUGH, BUT CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING ABSOLUTE NUMBER: IN 1985, OUT OF 23,241 AMERICANS RECEIVING DOCTORATE DEGREES, BLACKS RECEIVED 909.

IN AN AGE WHEN TECHNOLOGICAL AND SCIENTIFIC COMPETITION BETWEEN

7

NATIONS HAS NEVER BEEN MORE CRITICAL. IT'S INTERESTING TO NOTE THE FIELDS IN WHICH THOSE 909 BLACK DOCTORATES ARE CONCENTRATED.

JAMES E. BLACKWELL, PROFESSOR OF SOCIOLOGY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS IN BOSTON, BREAKS DOWN THE FIGURES IN HIS BOOK, MAINSTREAMING OUTSIDERS: THE PRODUCTION OF BLACK PROFESSIONALS. HE WRITES:

> "MORE THAN HALF OF THE DOCTORATES EARNED BY BLACKS ARE IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATION. IN 1985, BLACKS EARNED 503 DOCTORATES IN EDUCATION; 205 IN SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES; AND 75 IN THE HUMANITIES. BLACKS RECEIVED SEVEN DOCTORATES IN MATHEMATICS, THREE IN COMPUTER SCIENCE, 23 IN CHEMISTRY, 34 IN ENGINEERING, 18 IN LIFE SCIENCE AND ONLY FOUR IN PHYSICS."

MOREOVER, PROFESSOR BLACKWELL POINTS OUT THAT NOT A SINGLE BLACK RECEIVED A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN SUCH SPECIALIZATIONS AS PHARMACEUTICAL CHEMISTRY, THEORETICAL CHEMISTRY, BIOMEDICAL ENGINEERING, OPERATIONS RESEARCH, EMBRYOLOGY, STATISTICS AND AMERICAN STUDIES.

WHILE THE FIGURES REPRESENTING THE BLACK STUDENT POPULATION AS A WHOLE ARE DISMAL, A FURTHER ITEMIZATION OF THESE FIELDS IN REGARDS TO WOMEN ALLOW LITTLE ROOM FOR OPTIMISM.

ALTHOUGH THE TOTAL NUMBER OF DOCTORATES AWARDED TO BLACK WOMEN INCREASED IN THE '70S -- FROM 32 PERCENT OF ALL BLACK AMERICAN PH.D. CANDIDATES IN 1973 TO NEARLY 48 PERCENT IN 1979 -- THEIR UNDER-REPRESENTATION AS A GROUP IS APPARENT WHEN LOOKING AT THE AGGREGATE FIGURE FOR THE DECADE. THIS NUMBER REVEALS THAT BLACK MEN RECEIVED SIX OUT OF EVERY 10 DEGREES EARNED BY THE BLACK POPULATION AS A WHOLE, EVEN THOUGH WOMEN REPRESENT MORE THAN 50 PERCENT OF ALL BLACK MATRICULANTS IN BACCALAUREATE PROGRAMS.

AS PROFESSOR BLACKWELL POINTS OUT, "SINCE THERE IS STILL SUCH A CRITICAL SHORTAGE OF BLACKS WITH DOCTORATES IN THE ENTIRE LABOR FORCE, IT IS STILL IMPERATIVE TO INCREASE THE ABSOLUTE NUMBERS OF BLACK MEN AND WOMEN WITH THESE DEGREES."

WITH DEMOGRAPHIC TRENDS SHOWING MINORITIES AS THE FASTEST GROWING POPULATION GROUP IN AMERICA, IT IS APPARENT THAT OUR FUTURE ECONOMY AND LABOR FORCE WILL BE DEPENDENT UPON THEIR SKILLS AND ABILITIES. YET, AS A RESULT OF A LOST DECADE OF PROGRESS, IT IS EQUALLY TRUE THAT EFFORTS TOWARD FUTURE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ALREADY HAS BEEN SERIOUSLY UNDERMINED.

INDEED, ACCORDING TO THE BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS NEARLY 20 PERCENT OF THE JOBS EXPECTED TO BE AVAILABLE IN 1995 WILL REQUIRE FOUR OR MORE YEARS OF COLLEGE. MOREOVER, THE BUREAU ESTIMATES THAT A MAJORITY OF THE OTHER JOBS WILL REQUIRE SOME COLLEGE, ALTHOUGH FEWER THAN FOUR YEARS.

THE WASTED PROGRESS APPARENT IN THIS OMINOUS FORECAST IS OUTLINED BY WILLIAM RASPBERRY IN A RECENT BOSTON GLOBE EDITORIAL. HE WRITES:

> "AMERICA, MOVING AWAY FROM ITS SMOKESTACK PAST INTO A HIGH-TECH FUTURE, WILL NEED MORE AND MORE WELL-EDUCATED WORKERS. AN INCREASING PERCENTAGE OF THOSE WORKERS WILL HAVE TO BE MINORITIES, FOR THE SIMPLE REASON THAT MINORITIES ARE GROWING AT A FASTER RATE THAN WHITES AND WILL CONSTITUTE A GROWING PERCENTAGE OF THE YOUTH POPULATION. BUT THERE IS ANOTHER TREND THAT DESERVES ATTENTION. THE RATE OF COLLEGE ATTENDANCE BY MINORITY YOUNGSTERS -- ESPECIALLY BLACKS -- HAS BEEN FALLING IN RECENT YEARS. WHAT THAT MEANS IS THAT JUST WHEN THE OPPORTUNITIES FOR MINORITIES WILL, OUT OF DEMOGRAPHIC NECESSITY, BE GREATEST, THEIR FITNESS FOR THOSE OPPORTUNITIES WILL BE DIMINISHED."

THEREFORE OUR CONCERN FOR THE MINORITY YOUTH POPULATION MUST GO BEYOND MORAL OUTRAGE TO ONE OF ECONOMIC NECESSITY. HOW CAN WE REACH THIS GROUP? HOW CAN WE BREAK THE CYCLE OF POVERTY AND POOR JOB SKILLS THAT INVARIABLY LEAD TO WELFARE DEPENDENCY?

AS I SEE IT, HIGHER EDUCATION IS THE ONLY WAY TO MAKE SIGNIFICANT AND LASTING CHANGES IN THE LIVES OF BLACK MEN AND WOMEN. YET DISADVANTAGED YOUTH ACROSS THE COUNTRY LACK THE APPROPRIATE

RESOURCES AND INFORMATION THAT WILL LEAD THEM TO PURSUE A BACCALAUREATE DEGREE. THEY COME FROM FAMILIES WHO ARE TRAPPED IN THE CYCLE OF POVERTY. FAMILIES WHO CAN'T GUIDE THEIR CHILDREN IN THE DIRECTION OF EDUCATION BECAUSE THEY, THEMSELVES, NEVER LEARNED THE "SYSTEM."

THROUGH NEGLECT AND SELF ABSORPTION, WE, IN HIGHER EDUCATION, HAVE WATCHED AS THE NUMBERS OF BLACK STUDENT ENROLLMENTS DECLINED. AND FOR THOSE BLACK STUDENTS WHO WERE ABLE TO OVERCOME FORMIDABLE BARRIERS AND ENTER COLLEGE, WE'VE WITNESSED A MARKED INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF MINORITY DROP OUTS.

ONLY A FEW DECADES SINCE BROWN VERSUS THE TOPEKA BOARD OF EDUCATION AND THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1975, WE HAVE ONCE AGAIN REACHED A NADIR IN RACIAL UNDERSTANDING AND ATTITUDES.

ILLINOIS SENATOR PAUL SIMON DEFINES THIS DIVISION IN AMERICA AS EXISTING NOT BETWEEN BLACKS AND WHITES, HISPANICS AND ANGLOS, OR EVEN RICH AND POOR, BUT BETWEEN THOSE WHO HAVE HOPE AND THOSE WHO HAVE GIVEN UP.

THE CHARGE FACING US IN HIGHER EDUCATION TODAY IS, SIMPLY, WHAT CAN WE DO TO REINSTALL HOPE IN THE BLACK YOUTH POPULATION? OUR MISSION MUST BE NOT ONLY TO DRAW IN MORE BLACKS TO THE LEVEL OF PARITY, BUT ALSO TO WORK TOWARDS SUSTAINING AND ENCOURAGING THE NEARLY ONE MILLION BLACKS ALREADY IN COLLEGE.

HOW CAN WE DO THIS?

IN ORDER TO OFFSET DECLINING MINORITY ENROLLMENT FIGURES, EVERY COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY IN THE COUNTRY SHOULD WORK IN PARTNERSHIP WITH HIGH SCHOOLS AND THE PRIVATE SECTOR IN SETTING UP A FEEDER SYSTEM THAT WOULD TARGET AND TRACK MINORITY STUDENTS INTO COLLEGE.

ALREADY THERE ARE PROGRAMS IN EXISTENCE NOW, WITH PUBLIC COLLEGES AND URBAN HIGH SCHOOLS TAKING THE MAJOR INITIATIVE. BUT IN ORDER FOR THESE PROGRAMS TO HAVE A BROADER, LONG-TERM IMPACT, PRIVATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES MUST ALSO TAKE PART.

AN EXAMPLE OF ONE SUCH PROGRAM, CAREER BEGINNINGS, WAS DEVELOPED BY THE COMMONWEALTH FUND IN NEW YORK AND IS AN OUTGROWTH OF A PROJECT BEGUN THREE YEARS AGO AT HUNTER COLLEGE. IT IS NOW BEING MANAGED BY THE CENTER FOR HUMAN RESOURCES AT BRANDEIS' HELLER GRADUATE SCHOOL.

IN 24 SITES ACROSS THE COUNTRY, HIGH SCHOOL JUNIORS FROM LOW-INCOME FAMILIES ARE SELECTED TO PARTICIPATE IN PROGRAMS THAT WILL STRENGTHEN THEIR CHANCES TO GRADUATE FROM HIGH SCHOOL AND EITHER GAIN ADMISSION TO COLLEGE OR OBTAIN A FULL-TIME JOB WITH CAREER POTENTIAL.

THIS PROGRAM AND OTHERS LIKE ARE DESIGNED TO BUILD ON THE DEMONSTRATED ABILITIES OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS, BOTH MALE AND FEMALE, TO OVERCOME DIFFICULTIES AND TO ACHIEVE.

A MAJOR OBJECTIVE OF CAREER BEGINNINGS IS TO TARGET YOUNG PEOPLE WHO DEMONSTRATE GOOD ATTENDANCE RECORDS AND AVERAGE ACADEMIC ABILITY, WHO MIGHT BE OVERLOOKED BY OTHER PROGRAMS AIMED AT HIGH ACHIEVERS OR DROP OUTS.

THESE STUDENTS COME FROM FAMILIES WHO LIVE EITHER BELOW THE POVERTY LINE OR MARGINALLY ABOVE IT. THEY MAY BE IN FAMILIES WHERE COLLEGE EDUCATION IS NOT REGARDED AS A REALISTIC CHOICE OR WHERE PARENTS HAVE LIMITED ABILITIES TO HELP THEIR CHILDREN FIND PLACES IN THE WORK WORLD. THESE DISADVANTAGES USUALLY ARE AGGRAVATED BY GAPS IN THE SUPPORT SYSTEM THAT HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS NEED TO HELP THEM FULFILL THEIR COLLEGE OR EMPLOYMENT POTENTIAL.

AFTER ONE YEAR IN OPERATION, THE CAREER BEGINNINGS PROGRAM HAS ENROLLED APPROXIMATELY 2,350 HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS. OF THAT NUMBER, 80 PERCENT ARE ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED AND APPROXIMATELY 75 PERCENT ARE MINORITIES. NEARLY TWO-THIRDS ARE FEMALE.

AT THE HEART OF CAREER BEGINNINGS IS THE MENTOR PROGRAM. STUDENTS ARE ASSIGNED MENTORS WHOM THEY MEET WITH ON A MONTHLY

BASIS TO DISCUSS CAREER AND COLLEGE PLANNING. MENTORS INCLUDE BUSINESS EXECUTIVES, GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS, OWNERS OF SMALL BUSINESSES, EDUCATORS, COLLEGE PRESIDENTS, LAWYERS, DOCTORS, TECHNICIANS, PROFESSIONAL ATHLETES AND KEY COMMUNITY LEADERS.

S.A.T. AND A.C.T. PREPARATION, ACADEMIC DEVELOPMENT, SOCIAL SKILLS, CAREER PLANNING AND TEAM BUILDING ARE ALL A PART OF THE RANGE OF ACTIVITIES CAREER BEGINNINGS STUDENTS PARTICIPATE IN THROUGHOUT THE 24 SITES.

INSTITUTIONAL COLLABORATION BETWEEN COLLEGES, HIGH SCHOOLS, BUSINESS AND GOVERNMENT HAS CONTRIBUTED TO THE HIGH RATE OF SUCCESS EXPERIENCED BY CAREER BEGINNINGS IN ITS FIRST YEAR. JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT RESOURCES DURING THE SUMMER COMPONENT ACCOUNTED FOR MORE THAN 50 PERCENT OF ALL SUMMER JOBS WITH PRIVATE SECTOR PLACEMENTS PROVIDING THE REST. COOPERATION FROM THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY AGENCIES WAS VITAL TO THE SUCCESS OF THE EARLY START-UP OF THE PROGRAM.

THE YEAR-LONG COMPONENT OFFERS ADDITIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR STRONGER AND MORE EXTENSIVE COLLABORATIVE EFFORTS, WHICH WILL PAVE THE WAY FOR THE LONG TERM INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF CAREER BEGINNINGS IN MANY OF THE 24 SITES.

TRADITIONAL AND NONTRADITIONAL SOURCES HAVE BEEN USED TO FINANCE CAREER BEGINNING PROJECTS, AND TO ASSURE THEIR MATCHING FUNDS IN

THE FIRST YEAR. JOB TRAINING AND PARTNERSHIP ACT FUNDING WAS USED IN APPROXIMATELY 85 PERCENT OF THE SITES. WAGES PAID TO STUDENTS ACCOUNTED FOR A PORTION OF THE MATCH IN 50 PERCENT OF THE PROJECTS. COMMUNITY AND PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS AS WELL AS UNIVERSITY FOUNDATION PROVIDED SUPPORT TO ALMOST 20 PERCENT OF ALL PROJECTS, ALONG WITH AN EQUAL NUMBER OF CORPORATE FOUNDATIONS. SITES ALSO RELIED ON VOCATIONAL TRAINING FUNDS FROM FEDERAL AND STATE SOURCES.

THE GOAL OF CAREER BEGINNINGS AND OTHER PROGRAMS LIKE IT IS TO ENHANCE THE ASPIRATIONS OF CHILDREN FROM DISADVANTAGED BACKGROUNDS, ALLOWING THEM TO REALIZE THAT DROPPING OUT OF HIGH SCHOOL, GETTING PREGNANT, ABUSING DRUGS, AND CRIMINAL BEHAVIOR ARE NOT THEIR PRE-DESTINED PATHS.

INCREASED FEDERAL FUNDING IS IMPERATIVE IN ORDER FOR FEEDER PROGRAMS SUCH AS CAREER BEGINNINGS TO WORK. IN ADDITION, COMMUNITY FOUNDATIONS, JOB TRAINING DOLLARS AND PRIVATE DONATIONS MUST ALSO BE A PART OF THE EFFORT SO THAT THESE PROGRAMS CAN GROW BEYOND THEIR CURRENT SCOPE -- INTO THE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS AND GRAMMAR SCHOOLS.

INDEED, EVEN EXPANDING INTO THE GRADE SCHOOL YEARS MIGHT PROVE TOO LIMITING. WE MUST EVENTUALLY SET OUR SIGHTS ON YOUNG CHILDREN -- MAYBE AS EARLY AS KINDERGARTEN -- AND BUILD THEIR CONFIDENCE AND SENSE OF SELF WORTH IN ORDER TO REALLY MAKE A

SUBSTANTIAL IMPACT.

AS MARTIN LUTHER KING JR. ONCE SAID, "RACIAL UNDERSTANDING IS NOT SOMETHING THAT WE FIND BUT SOMETHING THAT WE MUST CREATE. AND SO THE ABILITY OF [BLACKS] AND WHITES TO WORK TOGETHER, TO UNDERSTAND EACH OTHER, WILL NOT BE FOUND READY-MADE; IT MUST BE CREATED BY THE FACT OF CONTACT."

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WILL HAVE TO SUPPORT US IN CREATING THIS CONTACT IN OUR SCHOOLS, BUSINESSES AND COMMUNITIES. TO STAND STILL AND DO NOTHING WILL MEAN JEOPARDIZING THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL WELL-BEING OF OUR FUTURE.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Dr. Handler.

Our next witness is Elizabeth Holtzman, District Attorney, Brooklyn, New York and a former Congresswoman.

I understand you were one of the founders of the Women's Caucus. Welcome here today, and you can begin your testimony.

STATEMENT OF ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN, DISTRICT ATTORNEY, KINGS COUNTY, BROOKLYN, NY

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I am very grateful for the opportunity, indeed, the privilege of appearing before you, especially because I hold in very high regard the distinguished gentleman from the Borough of Brooklyn, Congressman Owens, who is also a member of this subcommittee. And it is special pleasure to appear before him as well, and the other members of the subcommittee.

I want to congratulate you on holding these hearings on the terribly important issue of working women and the problems they confront because this is an issue that affects not just women, but the entire country.

Mr. Chairman, if I may, I would request that the text of my written testimony be incorporated in the record. And I would like to summarize a few of the points orally for you.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Allow me to interrupt me for one minute.

I should have announced at the beginning that all written testimony will be entered in its entirety into the record. And we do welcome summarization.

Thank you.

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

The work of women has traditionally been devalued, undervalued. Even the title "working women" suggests that the work that women traditionally do in the home does not count as work. Indeed, the work that women do at home is given no economic value whatsoever in this society. It is not included in the gross national product. I remember the former Secretary of Commerce, Juanita Krebs, a distinguished scholar in her own right, complaining about the devaluation of the work of women whether it is in the home or outside the home.

Congresswoman Snowe cited figures with respect to the issue of pay. In fact, women who work outside the home have to confront a number of very serious obstacles, not the least of which is the expectation that they will be paid substantially less for exactly the same work as a male counterpart.

In addition, many women who enter the work force will discover that they are segregated into primarily women-only jobs, most of which are paid substantially less than jobs that are held by men alone.

I mean there is litigation now in New York City involving emergency telephone operators. For example, police emergency telephone operators are virtually entirely women. They are paid substantially less than fire telephone emergency operators who are men. I believe that the differences is about $8,000. In fact, the women police emergency operators work under much more strenuous circumstances, the work is harder, and the pressure is harder.

And yet, they are paid more than $8,000 less than men doing a comparable job.

Not only are women paid less and segregated into specific jobs, but they are specifically denied opportunities to hold jobs because of prejudices and myths about women's intellectual capacities and various kinds of ability. I will cite you an experience from my being district attorney.

When I was assigned a detail of detectives to protect me, there was not a single woman included. And I asked the captain of the police squad why this was so. And he said to me, well, he said, your life is in danger. We cannot possibly assign a woman to protect you. And this was in 1982. And I said to the captain, well, since it is my life, I'll take that risk. And Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to report that I am still here five years later. But if I had not been district attorney and had not insisted, there was no way in the world that a woman would have been given that opportunity because of the sheer, absolute prejudice.

Women encounter not only that kind of prejudice in terms of the kinds of job opportunities they are given, but they encounter what has been called the "glass ceiling." Even if they get past the barrier of being hired, and even if they get past the barrier of the kind of job that they could be segregated into, there are serious barriers to promotion.

Again, to cite an experience from my being district attorney, when I came to that office, although there were more than 300 lawyers, more than a third of them women, not one, single woman was chief of any single unit in that office. It did not matter how loyal she was. It did not matter how intelligent she was. It did not matter how hard-working she was. She was not going to be promoted to be in charge of anything.

Well, one of the nice things about being a boss is that you can change that overnight. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to report that now about 45 percent—the number fluctuates from time to time. Sometimes it is over 50 percent—of all the units are headed by women, and a substantial number of the deputies are women. And I would not say despite that; I would say because of that, Mr. Chairman, we were able to achieve the highest conviction rates in New York City for several years in a row.

But I think that that is a problem that women confront whether it is in the public sector or in the private sector, and it is a very serious problem.

Another problem that women confront is the problem of sexual harassment or demeaning treatment, whether it is insistence on sexual favors in return for retention of a job or a promotion or the demeaning treatment of women, women encounter that in all fields of employment.

And the courts, for example, are not exempted. I can cite to you example after example in my own office of women prosecutors, attorneys, who have been demeaned in the courtroom, in fact, in front of juries. We once had a judge who threatened to take a woman prosecutor over his knee and spank her.

The other problem that women confront, aside from the basic economic problems of pay, promotion, and job opportunities, has to do with an issue that has been discussed before you and the prob-

lems of how women in particular, though to some extent men too are confronted with these problems—how they deal with the dual responsibility of providing economically for themselves and their families, and at the same time also making sure that their families are cared for.

The inadequacy of day care in this society is scandalous. The absence of the right of parental leaves is scandalous. We talk about how we value women and we value motherhood in this country, but the fact of the matter is that a woman who leaves her job to have a baby and to care for it can be fired, never to get her job back.

The absence of part-time and flexible time opportunities too has a very adverse impact on the ability of women to meet both economic and parental responsibilities.

And let me add one point here, Mr. Chairman, because you have asked about the issue of day care and its importance. I would suggest—and I am going to put on the hat of a district attorney here when I answer this question. One of the consequences of the makeshift availability of day care in this society is the injury to the children. How many cases do we have to prosecute of sexual abuse of children because day care centers are not adequately monitored? The staff that is recruited is inadequately paid. I recall reading a statistic that zoo keepers are paid more than attendants in day care centers. How can we recruit the best people to care for our Nation's children if we pay them such inadequate salaries?

On top of that, we have situations in which well-meaning people will take several children to care for them. There is inadequate compliance with fire codes, with building codes. How many times do we have to be confronted with the question of prosecution for criminally negligent homicide or other kinds of crimes when children die as a result of fires or other kinds of hazards in inadequately regulated and inadequately monitored day care centers?

These are the daily tragedies that happen across America because this country has not been willing to recognize the fact that women will work outside the home, that that is a permanent fact of life in America, that we cannot separate women from the responsibility to see that their children are cared for. And we have refused to provide high quality day care for working women, working parents, in this country. And I give you this dimension because it is one that is not often talked about but is a reality that I myself see.

Mr. Chairman, one final point that I would make here has to do with the issue of education. We are growing more and more a technological society. But women are traditionally and have been traditionally discouraged from becoming experts in science, in mathematics, in technological matters. And I see the problems of the wage gap increasing as we neglect to insure that women are not, even in educational areas, segregated in terms of the skills that they will be taught and the dreams that they will be encouraged to aspire to.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that as solutions to these problems, we must have vigorous enforcement of the laws already on the books, which we do not have. The fact that a district attorney's office in a city like Brooklyn could operate without promoting women system-

atically over a period of years is a testament to the inadequate enforcement of the simple anti-discrimination laws on the books.

Secondly, the laws obviously need to be changed with respect to not only assuring parental leaves, to provide a system of day care, to provide equal pay for work of comparable worth, but I think in addition, Mr. Chairman, the government has to set an example. This Congress can set an example. The Federal Government can set an example.

I just cite with some small regret that the televised joint hearings on the Iran-contragate scandal, which has won such important national attention, has not single woman sitting on that committee. When I served in the United States Congress, I was privileged to have been on the House Judiciary Committee during the Watergate hearings. And the absence of women may suggest again to the country that somehow women do not have the intellectual ability or are not capable of sharing in the decision making on the most important matters confronting the Nation. They are and the Congress can do much to help reshape public attitudes and give women the opportunities they are entitled to in this society.

Thank you.

[Prepared statement of Elizabeth Holtzman follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN, DISTRICT ATTORNEY OF KINGS COUNTY, NY

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR THE OPPORTUNITY OF TESTIFYING BEFORE THIS SUBCOMMITTEE ABOUT THE PROBLEMS OF WOMEN IN THE LABOR FORCE.

THIS YEAR MARKS THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION, A DOCUMENT THAT HAS PRESERVED A SYSTEM OF DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT IN THIS COUNTRY. WHILE THAT IS CAUSE FOR CELEBRATION, FOR MORE THAN ONE-HALF OF THIS COUNTRY'S POPULATION, WOMEN, THIS IS ALSO A TIME FOR SAD REFLECTION -- BECAUSE THE CONSTITUTION STILL DOES NOT RECOGNIZE THAT WOMEN ARE EQUAL UNDER THE LAW. THE LACK OF A FORMAL DECLARATION OF WOMEN'S EQUALITY EXPRESSES PERVASIVE DISCRIMINATION AND NEGATIVE ATTITUDES TOWARD WOMEN IN THIS COUNTRY. THIS PROFOUND DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN, WHICH CAN BE FOUND IN EVERY ASPECT OF OUR SOCIETY, HAS A PARTICULARLY HARMFUL IMPACT ON WOMEN IN THE LABOR FORCE.

THE NUMBER OF WOMEN IN AMERICA'S WORKFORCE HAS RISEN DRAMATICALLY IN THE LAST FEW YEARS AND ALL INDICATIONS ARE THAT THEIR NUMBERS WILL INCREASE IN THE FUTURE. TODAY, 45% OF THE WORKFORCE IS MADE UP OF WOMEN (51 MILLION WOMEN IN ALL), UP FROM 33% IN 1960. MOREOVER, BETWEEN NOW AND THE END OF THE CENTURY IT IS PROJECTED THAT TWO-THIRDS OF THE NEW ENTRANTS INTO THE WORKFORCE WILL BE WOMEN. WOMEN WHO WORK OUTSIDE THE HOME ARE NOT A PASSING PHENOMENON IN OUR SOCIETY. THEY ARE HERE TO STAY. BUT AMERICA HAS NOT YET ACCEPTED THIS REALITY, NOR TAKEN STEPS TO ELIMINATE THE RAMPANT DISCRIMINATION THAT WOMEN CONFRONT DAILY IN THE WORKPLACE.

THIS DISCRIMINATION IN THE WORKPLACE TAKES MANY FORMS. WOMEN ARE REFUSED EMPLOYMENT, PASSED OVER FOR PROMOTIONS, AND PAID LESS THAN MEN WHO DO COMPARABLE OR IDENTICAL WORK. WOMEN REMAIN SEGREGATED INTO OCCUPATIONS TRADITIONALLY HELD BY WOMEN, AND FACE SERIOUS OBSTACLES WHEN THEY TRY TO ENTER NEW FIELDS OF EMPLOYMENT TRADITIONALLY DOMINATED BY MEN. ON THE JOB, WOMEN ARE SUBJECTED TO SEXUAL HARASSMENT AND DEMEANING TREATMENT BY MALE EMPLOYERS AND COLLEAGUES. DESPITE ALL THE LIP SERVICE GIVEN TO MOTHERHOOD IN THIS COUNTRY, WOMEN MAY LOSE THEIR JOBS IF THEY LEAVE TO HAVE A BABY OR CARE FOR A SICK CHILD. THERE ARE TOO FEW OPPORTUNITIES FOR PART-TIME EMPLOYMENT OR FLEXIBLE WORK SCHEDULES THAT WOULD ALLOW WOMEN TO FULFILL FAMILY RESPONSIBILITIES, ECONOMIC DEMANDS AND THEIR CREATIVE POTENTIAL. AND SINCE THE BURDEN OF CHILD CARING STILL FALLS PRIMARILY ON THE WOMAN, THEY ARE MOST ADVERSELY AFFECTED BY THE UNAVAILABILITY OF QUALITY AFFORDABLE DAY CARE.

LET US EXAMINE THESE PROBLEMS IN GREATER DEPTH.

ONE OF THE MOST BLATANT INJUSTICES IS WAGE DISCRIMINATION. ON THE AVERAGE, WOMEN EARN 64 CENTS FOR EVERY DOLLAR A MAN EARNS, WHICH HAS BARELY CHANGED FROM 1960, WHEN THEY EARNED 57 CENTS. IN SOME CASES, WOMEN ARE DOING EXACTLY THE SAME JOB AS THEIR MALE COUNTERPARTS BUT RECEIVING LOWER WAGES. FOR EXAMPLE, IN NEW YORK CITY, POLICE EMERGENCY TELEPHONE OPERATORS (71% OF WHOM ARE WOMEN) ARE PAID UP TO $8,614 LESS THAN FIRE EMERGENCY TELEPHONE OPERATORS (97% OF WHOM ARE MEN). THE LOWER SALARY CANNOT BE EXPLAINED WITH THE ARGUMENT THAT THE WOMEN'S JOB IS EASIER: ON THE CONTRARY, THE LOWER-PAID WOMEN (POLICE OPERATORS) RESPOND TO MORE TYPES OF EMERGENCIES AND ARE UNDER MORE TIME PRESSURE.

A RELATED PROBLEM IS OCCUPATIONAL SEGREGATION. EMPLOYERS RELY ON DISCRIMINATORY BELIEFS ABOUT WOMEN'S INTELLECT, CHARACTER AND PHYSICAL CAPABILITIES TO DENY WOMEN EMPLOYMENT IN MALE-DOMINATED JOBS. FOR EXAMPLE, UNFOUNDED AND BIASED PERCEPTIONS OF WOMEN'S PHYSICAL STAMINA HAVE BEEN USED TO TRY TO BLOCK WOMEN'S ENTRY INTO THE POLICE FORCE, CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY, SANITATION AND FIREFIGHTING.

INSTEAD, WOMEN ARE SEGREGATED INTO JOBS TRADITIONALLY CONSIDERED "WOMEN'S WORK." THE GREAT MAJORITY OF WOMEN IN THE LABOR FORCE HOLD JUST SUCH SEX SEGREGATED JOBS. NEARLY HALF OF ALL WORKING WOMEN ARE EMPLOYED IN CLERICAL, SALES AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT JOBS, AND ANOTHER 20% ARE IN SERVICE OCCUPATIONS. WOMEN REMAIN OVERWHELMINGLY REPRESENTED IN SUCH JOBS AS SECRETARIES, NURSES, WAITRESSES AND LIBRARIANS.

NOT SURPRISINGLY, SEX SEGREGATED JOBS CARRY LOW SALARIES. (THE ARCHETYPE FOR WOMEN'S WORK IS, AFTER ALL, WORK DONE IN THE HOME, WHICH IS ASSIGNED NO ECONOMIC VALUE AND OMITTED FROM THE GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT.) A WOMAN IN THE LABOR FORCE MAY HOLD A JOB INVOLVING SKILLS AND RESPONSIBILITIES EQUAL TO A COMPARABLE POSITION HELD BY A MAN, BUT HER SALARY WILL BE LOWER. IN LOS ANGELES, FOR EXAMPLE, LIBRARIANS AND ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANTS WERE FOUND TO HAVE COMPARABLE JOBS. YET LIBRARIANS (OVERWHELMINGLY WOMEN) WERE PAID 12% LESS THAN ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANTS (OVERWHELMINGLY MEN).

THE CYCLE OF OCCUPATIONAL SEGREGATION PERPETUATES ITSELF. WHEN THERE ARE NO WOMEN IN A PARTICULAR JOB, IT REINFORCES THE VIEW THAT THE JOB CAN BE DONE ONLY BY A MAN. IN SUCH A CASE, WOMEN ARE DENIED THE OPPORTUNITY TO PROVE TO OTHERS OR EVEN TO THEMSELVES THAT THEY ARE PERFECTLY CAPABLE OF PERFORMING THE JOB. IN ADDITION, ATTITUDES ABOUT WOMEN'S ABILITIES AND ROLES ARE REFLECTED IN THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM. FROM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ON, WOMEN MAY NOT BE SUFFICIENTLY ENCOURAGED TO PURSUE STUDIES IN MATH AND SCIENCE OR TO SHARPEN SKILLS TRADITIONALLY ASSOCIATED WITH MALE ROLES. WHEN WOMEN LACK THE EDUCATIONAL PREREQUISITES FOR MALE-DOMINATED JOBS, SEGREGATED EMPLOYMENT PATTERNS ARE REINFORCED.

EVEN WHEN WOMEN SUCCESSFULLY BREAK THROUGH EMPLOYMENT BARRIERS AND ENTER NON-TRADITIONAL FIELDS, THEY ARE STILL SUBJECT TO DISCRIMINATION IN PROMOTIONS. REGARDLESS OF CAPABILITY, CREATIVITY OR COMMITMENT, MOST WOMEN REACH A "GLASS CEILING" IN EMPLOYMENT AND ARE PERMITTED TO ADVANCE NO FURTHER. THEY ARE SHUT OUT OF THE HIGHEST POSITIONS IN THEIR FIELD, REMAINING PRIMARILY ON THE LOWEST RUNGS OF THE CAREER LADDER. SUCH DISCRIMINATION CAN BE FOUND IN VIRTUALLY EVERY BUSINESS AND PROFESSION. FOR EXAMPLE, IN THE NATION'S 250 LARGEST LAW FIRMS, JUST 6% OF THE PARTNERS ARE WOMEN. IN EDUCATION, ONLY ABOUT 6% OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS ARE WOMEN. AND OF THE 6,543 DIRECTORSHIPS OF FORTUNE 500 COMPANIES, JUST 2.8% ARE HELD BY WOMEN.

WHY ARE WOMEN NOT PROMOTED TO THE HIGHEST LEVELS? JUST AS ANTIQUATED NOTIONS ARE USED TO KEEP WOMEN OUT OF JOBS ENTIRELY, THESE SAME STEREOTYPES AFFECT PROMOTION DECISIONS. FOR EXAMPLE, ONE STUDY OF WOMEN MANAGERS IN AMERICA FOUND THAT MYTHS ABOUT THEIR ABILITY TO MAKE BUSINESS DECISIONS, TRAVEL, TAKE CRITICISM, WORK WITH NUMBERS OR FUNCTION AS A MANAGER HINDER THEIR CAREER DEVELOPMENT.

THESE SAME MYTHS ALSO HINDER WOMEN WHO SEEK HIGH PUBLIC OFFICE. DURING MY FIRST CAMPAIGN FOR DISTRICT ATTORNEY, PEOPLE OPENLY QUESTIONED MY ABILITY, AS A WOMAN, TO PROSECUTE CRIMINALS (MY OFFICE HANDLES 70,000 ARRESTS A YEAR), TO SUPERVISE 800 EMPLOYEES, TO DEAL WITH MALE SUBORDINATES, AND TO HANDLE THE TOUGH DEMANDS OF AN EXECUTIVE JOB.

GIVEN THESE ATTITUDES, IT IS NOT SURPRISING THAT THERE ARE APPALLINGLY LOW NUMBERS OF WOMEN IN PUBLIC OFFICE, PARTICULARLY IN THE HIGHEST POSITIONS. ONE WOMAN SITS IN THE PRESIDENT'S CABINET TODAY, THE SAME NUMBER AS FIFTY YEARS AGO. THERE ARE ONLY 2 WOMEN IN THE SENATE, ONE FEWER THAN FIFTY YEARS AGO, AND ONLY 3 WOMEN GOVERNORS, JUST ONE MORE THAN SIXTY YEARS AGO. MORE PROGRESS HAS BEEN MADE IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WHERE THERE ARE 5 MORE WOMEN TODAY THAN 25 YEARS AGO. THIS MEANS THAT IT WILL TAKE ONLY 970 MORE YEARS FOR HALF OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO BE COMPRISED OF WOMEN. THE PROGNOSIS FOR EVEN THIS ADVANCEMENT IS NOT ESPECIALLY ENCOURAGING SINCE FEWER WOMEN RAN FOR THE HOUSE AND SENATE IN 1986 THAN IN 1984.

ASIDE FROM THE ENORMOUS PROBLEMS OF DISCRIMINATION IN HIRING, PAY, AND PROMOTION, WOMEN ALSO CONFRONT A WORKPLACE THAT IS OFTEN HOSTILE AND UNSUITED TO THEIR NEEDS.

WOMEN IN EVERY FIELD OF EMPLOYMENT FACE SEXUAL HARASSMENT AND DEMEANING TREATMENT FROM THEIR EMPLOYERS, COLLEAGUES, AND OTHER MALES IN THE WORKPLACE. IN NEW YORK CITY, FOR EXAMPLE, THE FIRST WOMEN FIREFIGHTERS WERE REPEATEDLY SUBJECTED TO EXTREME PHYSICAL HARASSMENT BY THEIR MALE CO-WORKERS, WHO REPORTEDLY EVEN TAMPERED WITH THEIR LIFE SAVING EQUIPMENT. IN MY OWN OFFICE, WOMEN PROSECUTORS HAVE REPORTED A NUMBER OF DISTURBING INCIDENTS OF DEMEANING TREATMENT FROM JUDGES, DEFENSE ATTORNEYS, AND COURT OFFICERS, INCLUDING AN INSTANCE IN WHICH A JUDGE THREATENED TO TAKE A FEMALE PROSECUTOR OVER HIS KNEE AND SPANK HER. THE PERVASIVENESS OF SUCH DEMEANING TREATMENT HAS BEEN IDENTIFIED BY EVERY STATE THAT HAS STUDIED THE PROBLEM.

ANOTHER CRUCIAL PROBLEM FACED BY AMERICAN WOMEN IS THE ABYSMAL LACK OF ADEQUATE CHILD CARE. TOO MANY WOMEN ARE FORCED TO MAKE THE EXCRUCIATING CHOICE BETWEEN KEEPING THEIR JOBS AND PROVIDING FOR THEIR FAMILY'S ECONOMIC SECURITY, OR LEAVING THEIR JOBS (AND POSSIBLY HAVING TO GO ON WELFARE) IN ORDER TO CARE FOR THEIR CHILDREN PROPERLY. CURRENTLY, ALMOST 10 MILLION CHILDREN UNDER THE AGE OF 6 HAVE MOTHERS IN THE WORKFORCE. ANOTHER 6 TO 7 MILLION "LATCHKEY" CHILDREN BETWEEN THE AGES OF 6 AND 13 HAVE NO CHILD CARE. BECAUSE THE FASTEST GROWING SECTION OF THE NATIONAL WORKFORCE IS MOTHERS WITH CHILDREN UNDER 6, THIS SITUATION, UNLESS CORRECTED, WILL ONLY WORSEN IN THE COMING YEARS.

DESPITE THE MAGNITUDE OF THIS PROBLEM, ONLY AN INFINITESIMAL NUMBER OF COMPANIES -- 0.04% -- ASSIST THEIR EMPLOYEES WITH CHILD CARE. AND THANKS TO CUTBACKS FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, 29 STATES SPEND LESS MONEY ON CHILD CARE TODAY THAN THEY DID IN 1981.

SIMILARLY, AT PRESENT, A MOTHER WHO LEAVES HER JOB TO CARE FOR A NEWBORN OR SICK CHILD CAN BE FIRED AND HAS NO RIGHT TO RETURN TO THAT JOB AT A LATER TIME. THUS, A WOMAN WHO CHOOSES TO HAVE A CHILD MUST CONFRONT THE POSSIBILITY OF LOSING HER SENIORITY, WHICH WILL AFFECT HER FUTURE PAY, THE POSSIBILITY OF UNEMPLOYMENT, AND THE DIFFICULTY OF FINDING A NEW JOB. WHILE MOST MEN DO NOT BEAR SIGNIFICANT RESPONSIBILITY FOR CHILD-REARING IN OUR SOCIETY, MEN WHO DO ACCEPT SUCH RESPONSIBILITY WOULD FACE THE SAME PROBLEMS.

MANY MOTHERS ALSO REQUIRE A PART-TIME OR FLEXIBLE SCHEDULE SO THAT THEY CAN BOTH EARN A LIVING AND FULFILL THEIR FAMILY OBLIGATIONS. SADLY, TOO FEW EMPLOYERS PROVIDE THEIR EMPLOYEES WITH THE OPTION OF PART-TIME OR FLEXIBLE HOURS.

THE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES OF WORKPLACE DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN ARE FAR-REACHING AND DEEPLY DISTURBING. PLAINLY, WORKPLACE DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN CAN HAVE AN ADVERSE ECONOMIC IMPACT ON A FAMILY WHEN A MAN AND WOMAN SHARE ECONOMIC RESPONSIBILITY FOR IT. BUT, WHEN A WOMAN IS THE SOLE PROVIDER FOR HER FAMILY, AS HAS INCREASINGLY BEEN THE CASE FOR THE PAST FEW DECADES, THE ECONOMIC IMPACT ON THE FAMILY OF WORKPLACE DISCRIMINATION CAN BE DEVASTATING. NATIONWIDE, 77 PERCENT OF ALL THOSE IN POVERTY ARE WOMEN AND CHILDREN. THE FAILURE TO END WORKPLACE DISCRIMINATION HAS HAD AND WILL CONTINUE TO HAVE THE EFFECT OF SENTENCING MILLIONS OF CHILDREN TO GROW UP IN POVERTY.

COMPOUNDING THE DIFFICULTIES OF WOMEN HAS BEEN THE THE REAGAN ADMINISTRATION'S HOSTILITY TO WOMEN'S EQUALITY AND ITS DECISION TO REVERSE THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S HISTORICAL ROLE OF PROMOTING WOMEN'S RIGHTS. THE ADMINISTRATION HAS OPPOSED THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT, AFFIRMATIVE ACTION, AND THE VERY NOTION OF COMPARABLE WORTH, AND HAS ENACTED ENORMOUS BUDGET CUTS --IN NUTRITION, AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN, AND THE WOMEN, INFANTS AND CHILDREN PROGRAM -- THAT HIT WOMEN AND THEIR CHILDREN HARDEST. THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE HAVE CUT BACK SHARPLY ON EFFORTS TO PROTECT WOMEN FROM DISCRIMINATION. THIS ADMINISTRATION HAS SOUGHT TO PERPETUATE THIS HOSTILITY TO WOMEN'S CONCERNS BY NOMINATING ROBERT BORK, A RIGID OPPONENT OF THE RIGHTS OF WOMEN AND MINORITIES, TO THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT.

WHAT CAN BE DONE TO REVERSE THIS NATIONWIDE PATTERN OF DISCRIMINATION AND TO AFFORD WOMEN EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY IN THE WORKPLACE?

I SUGGEST THE FOLLOWING:

1) THIS NATION MUST MAKE A COMMITMENT TO END DISCRIMINATION IN HIRING AND PROMOTION AND TO OFFER WOMEN AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY TO ENTER AND ADVANCE IN EVERY FIELD OF EMPLOYMENT. IN MY OWN OFFICE, A FIRM COMMITMENT TO WOMEN'S ADVANCEMENT PRODUCED DRAMATIC RESULTS IN A SHORT PERIOD OF TIME. WHEN I FIRST BECAME DISTRICT ATTORNEY IN 1982, WHILE THERE WERE OVER 300 STAFF ATTORNEYS IN MY OFFICE, THERE WERE NO WOMEN ON THE EXECUTIVE STAFF AND NO WOMEN WHO WERE HEADS OF TRIAL BUREAUS (SUCH AS SEX CRIMES, HOMICIDE, OR NARCOTICS.) TODAY, 45% OF THE BUREAU CHIEFS ARE WOMEN, AND ONE-THIRD OF DEPUTY BUREAU CHIEFS ARE WOMEN. I BELIEVE THAT SIMILAR EFFORTS BY MANAGERS AND ADMINISTRATORS CAN GREATLY IMPROVE WORKPLACE CONDITIONS FOR WOMEN.

2) THE WORKPLACE MUST BE ADAPTED TO HELP BREAK DOWN THE ARBITRARY BIFURCATION OF RESPONSIBILITY IN THE FAMILY UNIT BETWEEN MEN AND WOMEN THAT HAS GIVEN MEN THE PRIMARY ECONOMIC RESPONSIBILITY AND WOMEN THE PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY FOR CHILD REARING. BY RESTRUCTURING AND HUMANIZING THE WORKPLACE, A MORE EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSIBILITY CAN BE ACHIEVED IN AMERICAN SOCIETY. CREATING GREATER OPPORTUNITIES FOR PART-TIME WORK AND FLEXIBLE HOURS, ENABLING WORKING MEN AND WOMEN TO TAKE PARENTAL LEAVES TO CARE FOR DEPENDENTS, AND MAKING AVAILABLE QUALITY CHILD CARE FOR WORKING FAMILIES WILL MAKE IT POSSIBLE FOR MEN AND WOMEN TO SHARE ECONOMIC AND CHILD REARING RESPONSIBILITIES AS EQUAL PARTNERS.

3) THIS COUNTRY MUST ENSURE THAT WOMEN HAVE THE SKILLS NEEDED TO END THEIR SEGREGATION IN UNSKILLED, LOW PAYING JOBS. THERE MUST BE EQUAL OPPORTUNITY FOR WOMEN AT EVERY EDUCATIONAL LEVEL AND SPECIAL EMPHASIS MUST BE GIVEN TO TRAINING WOMEN IN MATH, SCIENCE, AND COMPUTER LITERACY. AT PRESENT, FEWER THAN 4% OF WORKING WOMEN HAVE ENTERED THE FIELDS OF MEDICINE AND ENGINEERING. AS OUR NATION ADVANCES TECHNOLOGICALLY, SCIENTIFIC EXPERTISE WILL BECOME A PREREQUISITE FOR AN INCREASING NUMBER OF JOBS, PARTICULARLY HIGH PAYING JOBS.

4) GOVERNMENT MUST LEAD THE WAY IN THE STRUGGLE FOR WOMEN'S EQUALITY. IT CAN DO THIS IN A NUMBER OF WAYS. FIRST, IT MUST VIGOROUSLY ENFORCE EXISTING ANTI-DISCRIMINATION LAWS. THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT, EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION AND THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION MUST BE STRENGTHENED AND REQUIRED TO COMBAT SEX DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT AGGRESSIVELY. SECOND, CONGRESS MUST PASS STRONG NEW LAWS ADDRESSING THE PROBLEMS I HAVE DISCUSSED, PARTICULARLY ENACTING A COMPREHENSIVE CHILD CARE PROGRAM, ADOPTING PARENTAL LEAVE AND COMPARABLE WORTH LEGISLATION, AND CLOSING LOOPHOLES IN EXISTING LAWS THAT HAVE HURT WOMEN IN THE AREAS OF GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS AND FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS. THIRD, THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT MUST PUT PRESSURE ON STATES AND CITIES TO TAKE A MORE ACTIVE ROLE IN ENFORCING ANTI-DISCRIMINATION LAWS. FOURTH, SYSTEMATIC EFFORTS MUST BE MADE TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF WOMEN ELECTED AND APPOINTED TO TOP GOVERNMENT POSITIONS. IN ADDITION TO THEIR TREMENDOUS SYMBOLIC VALUE, THESE EFFORTS WILL HAVE A CONCRETE VALUE IN ENSURING THAT WOMEN'S CONCERNS ARE PROPERLY ADDRESSED. FIFTH, CONGRESS MUST OPPOSE THE APPOINTMENT OF ROBERT BORK SO THAT IT WILL NOT ENSHRINE ANTI-WOMEN ATTITUDES IN THE SUPREME COURT.

FINALLY, CONGRESS ITSELF MUST SET AN EXAMPLE THROUGH ITS OWN ACTIONS AND PRACTICES. FOR INSTANCE, I WAS DISAPPOINTED THAT THERE WERE NO WOMEN ON THE JOINT COMMITTEES INVESTIGATING THE IRAN-CONTRA SCANDALS, PERHAPS THE MOST VISIBLE CONGRESSIONAL FORUM. THIRTEEN YEARS AGO, BARBARA JORDAN AND I SERVED ON THE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE THAT CONSIDERED PRESIDENT NIXON'S IMPEACHMENT. THE ABSENCE OF WOMEN IN THE IRAN-CONTRA HEARINGS ONLY FOSTERS THE REAGAN ADMINISTRATION'S ATTEMPTS TO PORTRAY WOMEN AS INCAPABLE OF DEALING WITH COMPLEX POLITICAL ISSUES. ONLY A STRONG AND VISIBLE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITMENT TO WOMEN'S EQUALITY WILL SEND A MESSAGE THROUGHOUT THE NATION THAT WORKPLACE DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN WILL NOT BE TOLERATED.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Ms. Holtzman.
Ms. Lee.

STATEMENT OF IRENE LEE, ON BEHALF OF THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR WOMEN OF COLOR

Ms. LEE. Thank you. On behalf of the National Institute for Women of Color, I am pleased to accept this invitation to appear before the subcommittee and present testimony on women of color in the work force.

Let me add my congratulations and admiration to the subcommittee for convening this two-day hearing. And I certainly would want to reinforce the remarks of Dr. Handler, as well as Ms. Holtzman, concerning issues of access, particularly in higher education of recruitment, enrollment, retention and graduation, as well as the kind of supportive services that are needed.

I would like to provide just a small bit of background information about the National Institute so that the testimony which follows will be understood in a context. The National Institute for Women of Color is a nonprofit organization founded in 1981. Its mission is to enhance the strengths of diversity and to promote educational and economic equity for women of color, women who are Hispanic, Black, Asian American, Pacific Islander, American Indian and Alaskan native. The Institutes promotes the interests of these groups by focusing on mutual concerns and bringing together women who are traditionally isolated.

Because of the psychological impact of being considered a minority and the restrictions rendered by the term minority, the National Institute uses and promotes the phrase "women of color."

I would like to begin with the statement that women's work from all of our perspectives is the backbone of our country in paid or unpaid capacities, in homes, schools, offices, factories and farms. Yet, by virtually every statistical measure, women have not achieved a share of America's bounty that is equal to that of men, not under the laws, in the work place or the home, not as youth, adults or senior citizens. This is particularly true for women of color who earn less than half of the wages of working men, seldom have full-time, year-round employment, are often forced into narrow job categories, have little or no upward mobility, bear a disproportionate share of responsibility for family maintenance with few resources, and are more likely to be under or unemployed.

Yet, women of color are a major part of the U.S. work force while they experience the worst aspects of participation. Conservative estimates of data from the U.S. Census Bureau document that women who are Hispanic, Black, Native American, Asian American, Pacific Islander and Alaska natives number approximately 30 million. Of these women of color, most are in the work force. Reliable Department of Labor and Census Bureau data indicate that there were 51 million women 16 years of age and over working or looking for work in 1985. It is obvious that from one-third to one-half of these 51 million women workers are women of color.

However, women of color earn much less than other workers. Research performed over the last decade shows that the lowest paid, most impoverished and least secure workers are women of color.

A few statistics—while all women earn an average of 64 cents for every dollar earned by men, Hispanic women earn 52 cents and Black women 56 cents for every dollar earned by men. This percentage holds true for women of color in comparison to all men for decades from 1955 through 1985. That is the median income of women of color has hovered about 55 percent of men's income for the last three decades.

It is a small wonder then that women of color account for the highest percentage of female-headed, single parent families that live in poverty. In 1984 women maintained more than 73 percent of poor Black families and 49 percent of poor Hispanic families.

Not only do women of color earn little more than half of what men earn, but when employed, women of color are most apt to work on a part-time basis. Again, looking at the 1984 data on women heads of households, only 31 percent of the women of color householders were employed full-time, year-round versus 37 percent of white women family heads.

Women of color are more likely to be employed in the pink and blue collar categories, clerical, service, retail sales, craft and operative. Furthermore, within these categories women of color are concentrated in jobs segregated by race and ethnicity. Of the approximately 400 occupations identified by the U.S. Department of Labor in their handbook, women are concentrated in only 20, primarily clerical, sales, service, blue collar and professional managerial categories. Yet, women of color are only concentrated in about eight of these job categories.

For example, Mexican American and Puerto Rican women are found largely in agricultural work and operative occupations such as sewing machine operators.

Asian American women, Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, Thai are over-represented in service and technical occupations such as electrical assemblers and launderers.

Black women as historically continue to be concentrated in jobs as household workers, cooks and aids of various types.

Native American women too are concentrated in occupational categories with aid titles, child care aid, teacher's aid, nurse's aid, welfare aid.

White women are primarily concentrated in administrative support jobs such as secretary, management assistant, bookkeepers.

In addition to these categories, all women of color have made great inroads into white collar jobs but primarily through clerical positions.

Finally, women of color tend to be invisible to policymakers. As you are looking for different roles that you can do to support the efforts of women of color to get out of poverty into the work force, part of the responsibility for the state of ignorance regarding women of color in the work force has to do with the lack of data collection by Federal data agencies, including the Labor Department and the Census Bureau.

I would simply like to summarize the concluding remarks in the written testimony on personal and family ramifications of women of color in the work force.

It is our belief that working full-time, year-round, earning an equitable wage based on the value of the job, not the race, ethnicity

or gender of the person doing it, is the best way to prevent poverty and improve living standards.

I would encourage the subcommittee to continue to look at existing pieces of legislation, including the Job Training Partnership Act and those provisions which support child and day care, transportation, stipends. Those are the important provisions which need to continue to be reinforced and expanded if women of color are to succeed in the coming decade.

Thank you very much.

[Prepared statement of Irene Lee follows:]

Prepared Statement of Irene Lee on Behalf of National Institute for Women of Color

FORWARD

On behalf of the National Institute for Women of Color (NIWC), I am pleased to accept the invitation to appear before this Subcommittee and present this testimony on women of color in the work force.

First, I must provide you with some background information about NIWC itself, so that the testimony which follows will be understood in its proper context.

NIWC is a non-profit organization, founded in 1981. Its mission is to enhance the strengths of diversity and to promote educational and economic equity for women of color; i.e., women who are Hispanic, Black, Asian American, Pacific Islander, American Indian and Alaska Native. NIWC promotes the interests of these groups by focusing on mutual concerns and bringing together women who traditionally have been isolated. Because of the psychological impact of beilng considered a minority and the restrictions rendered by the term "minority", NIWC uses and promotes the phrase "women of color" to convey unity, self-esteem, political and global status.

In carrying out its mission, NIWC engages in the following types of activities:

* leadership skill development
* promotion and recognition of women of color leaders
* public education on the status and basic needs of women of color --collectively and individually
* providing a support network for women of color
* public policy and issue analysis
* public policy advocacy.

The specific projects of NIWC have included:

* The Brown Papers, issue analysis papers for and about women of color
* NIWC Network News, a periodic newsletter with notices of meetings, new publications, professional opportunities, and special notices
* The National Strategies Conference for Women of Color, a bi-annual event bringing together women from all over the U.S. and the globe to share or develop strategies for addressing urgent concerns
* The Outstanding Women of Color Awards, a means of identifying and honoring the leaders among us
* Basic information collection and dissemination, through Fact Sheets and public presentations
* Advocacy, issue-by-issue analysis and promotion of the perspectives of women of color, as well as raising awareness among women of color about issues and priniciples of feminism.

INTRODUCTION

Women of color are a greatly diverse population with a long, long history of workforce participation and income-generating enterprises. By conservative estimates of data from the U.S. Census Bureau, women who are Hispanic, Black, Native American, Asian American, Pacific Islanders, and Alaska Natives, number approximately 30 million. Of these women of color, most are in the work force. Because reliable Department of Labor and Census Bureau data indicate that there were 51 million women 16 years of age and over working or looking for work in 1985, it becomes obvious that from 1/3 to 1/2 of women workers are women of color.

Women of color earn much less than other workers, we are far less likely to be employed full-time, year-round. When we are employed, our jobs are in the "pink" and blue collar categories: clerical, service, retail sales, craft and operative. Furthermore, within these categories women of color are concentrated in jobs segregated by race and ethnicity.

The intersection of practices which result in discrimination by sex and race/ethnicity has a tremendously negative impact on women of color. Our job choices are severely limited, no matter how willing, well prepared, or assertive we are. Once on the job, our upward mobility is also severely limited. When we are out of a job, the burden of job searching is greater because it is much harder to find work that fits the paradigm for women of color in the economically depressed areas in which we live.

Consequently, when considering solutions to problems of workers, it is very important to examine the differing impact upon the various populations affected. Just as what is good for men workers is not necessarily good for women workers, so too is it true that what helps white women workers, does not necessarily help workers who are women of color. Moreover, because of differences among populations of color, the workforce experience of each group also must be considered separately and factored into the larger picture.

THE WORKING POOR

Research performed over the last decade shows that the lowest paid, most impoverished, and least secure workers are women of color. While all women earn an average of $0.64 for every dollar earned by men, Hispanic women earn $0.52 and Black women $0.56 to the $1. This percentage holds true for women of color in comparison to all men for the decades from 1955 through 1985. That is, the median income of women of color has hovered about 55% of men's income for the the last three decades.

It is no wonder then that women of color account for the highest percentage of female-headed, single-parent families that live in poverty. In 1984 women maintained more than 73% of poor Black families and 49% of poor Hispanic families. In that same

year, the unemployment rate among female heads of households was 10.3%; the national average was 7.5%. For women with children under age six, the rate was even higher: a whopping 20.2% Of these female-headed families, 61% of the women householders worked to support their families. Not only do women of color earn little more than half of what men earn, but when employed, women of color are most apt to work on a part-time basis. Again, looking at the 1984 data on women heads of households, only 31% of the women of color householders were employed full-time, year-round, along with 37% of white women family heads.

CAUSES

While some of the reasons for greater workforce problems among women of color can be attributed to inadequate educational preparation and limited job experience, there are other factors which contribute to this deplorable situation.

For one thing, there is a tremendous differential between women and men in occupations. Of the approximately 400 occupations identified by the U.S. Department of Labor in their handbook, women are concentrated in about 20, in clerical, sales, service, blue collar, and professional/managerial categories. Women of color, however, are concentrated in about 8 job categories.

For example, Mexican American and Puerto Rican women are found largely in agricultural work and operative occupations, such as sewing machine operators. Asian American women (Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, Thai) are over-represented in service and technical occupations, such as electrical assemblers and launderers. Black women, as historically, continue to be concentrated in jobs as household workers, cooks, and aides of various types. Native American women too are concentrated in occupational categories with "aide" titles: child care aide, teacher's aide, nurse's aide, welfare aide. White women are primarily concentrated in administrative support jobs, such as secretary, management assistant, bookkeepers. In addition to these categories, all women of color have made great inroads into white-collar jobs through clerical positions. Researchers have concluded that the occupational and wage differentials (unexplained by education and work experience) are the effect of discrimination based on gender, race and/or ethnicity.

Another problem-causing area concerns official definitions of employment and unemployment. People with jobs which pay a wage are counted as employed, regardless of whether they are working one or more part-time jobs, or are "discouraged workers" (that is people who are seeking paid work but who have been unsuccessful for an extended period of time). Women, and especially women of color, are far more likely to be under-employed and discouraged workers because of the limited pool of jobs open to women. Twice as often as men, women under-employed and discouraged workers. Furthermore, women are twice as likely as men to have part-time

work because that is all that is available. Such workers are counted as employed but this disguises the fact of under-employment. Women of color, again, are more vulnerable to this problem and often must piece together several part-time jobs to earn sufficient income for personal and family needs. Finally, not counted at all in either employed or unemployed categories are women who receive public assistance and those who have simply given up seeking a job actively because they know that there isn't any. Here again women of color fall through the cracks.

Part of the responsibility for the state of ignorance regarding women of color in the workforce, and therefore the lack of appropriate, remedying action, lies with Federal data collection agencies. For years the Labor Department and Census Bureau neglected to gather information about women in racial/ethnic minority populations. Moreover, once it was established that such data is useful and needed, the backlog of comparative information didn't exist, so long-term measurement has been nearly impossible. In addition, because of the novelty of focus on women, surveys are not always consistent from time to time.

Furthermore, even where statistics are available, they usually reflect another inadequacy of Federal data collection: under-counting and inappropriate grouping of racial/ethnic minority populations. For example, it has been traditional practice to lump all Asian and Pacific Island peoples together. Thus it becomes nearly impossible to document the plight of native Hawaiian women, as compared with new Asian immigrants or third generation Japanese and Chinese American women.

As another illustration, data on Hispanics was not available until recent years because this population was usually counted among whites. Therefore, surveys failed to document the status of Mexican American, Puerto Rican and other Latin American peoples as culturally-ethnically distinct groups. Since information has begun to emerge on a case-by-case basis, with breakouts for women, it has come to light that Hispanic women have the lowest educational attainment levels of all groups. This information is significant in developing remedies to employment needs of Hispanic women. Asian American women, on the other hand, have very high educational attainment levels but are significantly under-employed when in the work force.

Also it is important to note here that thus far in this testimony, little mention has been made of Native American (American Indian and Alaska Native), Asian-American,, and Pacific Islander women. Again, this is a failure of data collection agencies. Despite NIWC's 6-year campaign to get the Census Bureau and the Department of Labor to collect and prepare information on these groups by gender, very little is available. Therefore, when fact sheets or other materials are prepared women of color, information on Native American, Asian, and Pacific women must be extrapolated from data on the popualtions as a whole. For example, it is known that unemployment on

reservations often averages 50%. If there are data, by gender, on the numbers of persons living on reservations, then it is possible to project that half the unemployed must be women.

NIWC has projected that Native American women are the lowest earners of all women of color, based on available information about reservation employment, wages in economically depressed rural and urban areas, and the small numbers of Native American women with advanced degrees or in professional/managerial jobs. On the other hand, Asian American (Japanese, Chinese, Korean, Vietnamese, Pilipino, Thai, Asian Indian) women are projected to be among the highest earners among women of color based on their high educational attainment levels and concentration in technical fields. That is not to say, however, that Asian American women are high earners. In fact, given their education levels, this population segment is seriously under-employed. Furthermore, given the previous perspective on unemployment among women of color, it is probable that Asian American women are experiencing a seriously under-reported problem there also.

DISCRIMINATION

Any discussion of the concerns of working women of oclor must begin with an understanding of discrimination --its definition, its characteristics, and its impact. Discrimination cuts through every single aspect of the lives of men and women of color. It limits access to resources, whether they are jobs, homes, etc. Discrimination is founded on sterotypes which have only in recent years become subject to legal sanctions. It is a burden which both constricts the options of women of color and spurs on women of color to exert extra effort to achieve. The fact and impact of discrimination is readily aparent when the status of women of color is examinied with respect to two issue areas: sexual harassment and pay equity.

The increase in this past decade, in the number of women entering and staying in the labor force (though women of color have always had a high labor force attachment) has focused new attention on an old problem --sexual harrassment. While the problem is an old one, its analysis by women has taken on a new twist. For the first itme this unacceptable behavior by employers and co-workers was recognized as having an economic impact by affecting the woman's ability to retain or be effective in her job. The caselaw which established sexual harassment as a legal theory were heralded as breakthroughs for women's equality in the workplace. As debate continues about the issue, one fact consistently fails to emerge: the impact and contribution of women of color in establishing the concept.

The first case establishing sexual harassment as a legal theory of recovery under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act was brought by a Black woman and originally filed on the basis of race rather than sex discrimination. Analysts and advocates are only now beginning to agree that race and sex both operate to make women of color more often the victims of harassment. In

most instances, the harasser enjoys a position of market place power relative to the victim. Stereotypic ideas about the availability or morals of women --particularly women of color-- as well as the propensity for women of color to be in subordinate employment situations, make women of color especially vulnerable. When this vulnerability is paired with a lack of access to systems of redress, women of color most often have only a limited set of options: remain in an intolerable situation or lose a much needed source of income. NIWC projects that thousands of women of color are victims of sexual harassment each years.

Pay equity, like sexual harassment, is an issue that critically affects working women of color. Pay equity has been identified as the single most important work issue affecting women today. The purpose of pay equity is to eliminate discriminatory bias from wage-setting practices. While most of the general public recognizes the term "pay equity", they fail to link pay inequity to race and ethnicity as well as sex. In fact, many advocates continue to view pay equity as solely a women's issue in spite of this country' tradition of tying specific work and specific pay to the race and ethnicity, as well as the gender, of the worker. Only recently, through the joint efforts of NIWC and the National Committee on Pay Equity, has the impact of pay equity on women of color been studied and documented.

Labor market routes for women of color often consist of the following: prohibitions and barriers to hiring in certain professions and occupations, followed by gradual inroads into the bottom levels of these occupations, followed, finally, by "white flight" from the occupations and resulting in women of color dominated job-ghettos. Consider:

* the major workplace change for Black women in the last 20 years has been out of household work and into the bottom rungs of clerical jobs;

* that over 60% of Black women clericals are employed in the public sector; and

* over half of <u>these</u> have earnings which place them below 150% of the poverty line.

Given this situation, it is no wonder that pay equity is a critical issue for working women of color.

<u>CURRENT ISSUES</u>

<u>Job Training and Vocational Education</u>. Women and girls make up half the 17 million participants in vocational education; likewise, they are just over half of all job training program participants. Despite this level of participation, over 90% of the women and girls continue to be tracked into traditionally female-dominated occupations: i.e., jobs with low wages, limited fringe benefits, and even more limited options for upward mobility. Within the last 10 years, efforts have been made to especially target employment training and vocational

services to low-income women. While these efforts have been welcome, limited federal monitoring and oversight, gaps in support services, and inadequate follow-up have made it impossible to paint a comprehensive picture of the long term success of these programs. Even more disconcerting is the lack of data collection systems which would allow guaging of participation and success rates of women of color. Inadequate funding of the Job Training Partnership Act and the Perkins Vocational Education Act perpetuate the failure of these systems to provide needed services or to assess their impact on women of color and their families.

Welfare Reform. Contrary to popular belief, most poor people are white: according to 1985 data, 57% of the nation's poor were white (non-Hispanic), 27% were Black (non-Hispanic), and 12% wer Hispanic. Nevertheless, the rate of poverty for various racial/ethnic minority groups is disproportionately high: in that same year 31.3% of Black Americans and 29% of Hispanics were counted as poor, compared with 11.4% of whites who were poor. Moreover, because children and adults who live in female-headed households are more likely to be poor and of a racial/ethnic minority group, the stereotype persists that women of color are indigent, welfare-dependent, mothers of many children. According to the same data, "More poor people live in families headed by married couples or by men than in families headed by women, nationally 43% versus 35%"...and "the average family size is less than 4 persons, including one or two parents."

Welfare reform, therefore, must be designed to meet the real, not stereotypic or mythical, needs of people in distress. Unfortunately, however, because of such myths, certain groups of women are unfairly penalized and costly and ineffective public policy has been enacted. In contrast, a comprehensive, flexible system of alternatives is what is needed. Such proposals have been put forth by the National Coalition on Women, Work and Welfare, and the Women's Economic Justice Project of Boston, the Women's Economic Agenda Project of California, and the Women's Economic Agenda Working Group organized under the Institute for Policy Studies. Such proposals call for --

- adequate income maintenance, at least at the level of poverty subsistence rather than below it;
- educational services and employment training;
- adequate support services, such as child care and transportation; and
- effective child support enforcement (which does not penalize men who are already poor).

Minimum Wage. Nearly two-thirds (63%) of minimum wage workers are women, with a disproportionately high percent of Black and Hispanic women workers among that number. Among workers paid hourly, 66% work part-time. Sixty percent of all workers paid by the hour and whose households live in poverty have earnings at or near the minimum wage. In contrast to families with minimum wage workers that escape poverty due to the earnings of other family members, most poor workers are their family's sole source of earnings. Seven in ten poor minimum wage workers were their family's only earner (as of March 1985). A majority of these poor families were female-headed. Therefore, the issue of increased minimum wage disproportionately affects women of color who are most often in jobs which are part-time and which pay the minimum.

The current minimum wage is $3.35 per hour. It has remained at that level since 1981, despite the fact that consumer prices have risen by 30%. The minimum wage was designed to provide a family of three sufficient income to escape poverty. However, a full-time, year-round worker earning the current minimum wage brings home $6,968 a year; only 77% of the 1987 poverty threshhold for a family of three.

While NIWC and many others advocate for expanded basic skills training programs for new and re-entry workers, such programs would do little to alleviate the problem of working poor because without a higher wage floor, workers would finish training only to enter minimum wage jobs. Such jobs do not allow workers to escape poverty. It should be noted that of the 2.1 million workers, age 25 and above, who were paid hourly and earned the minimum wage or less in 1986, nearly two out of every three had four years of high school or some college education. Thus, the current low level of earnings of hourly and minimum wage workers appears more directly related to the low level of the minimum wage than to their individual lack of basic skills.

PERSONAL AND FAMILY RAMIFICATIONS

Working full-time, year-round, earning an equitable wage (based on the value of the job not the race, ethnicity or gender of the person doing it) is the best way to prevent poverty and improve living standards. Unfortunately, however women of color strive to work their way up, there are barriers which make it impossible.

As has been stated previously, women of color

* earn less than half of men when working
* seldom have full-time, year-round employment
* are forced into narrow job categories
* have little or no upward mobility

* bear a disproportionate share of responsibility for family maintenance with fewest resources

* are more likely to be un-, under-, and non-employed

As a result women of color are less likely to have retirement or pension plans and health insurance. Without the latter, women of color are more likely to refrain from making regular doctor visits and experience more health problems due to lack of care. Moreover, given the limited range and low-level of job options for women of color, the chances are greater for these workers to be employed in occupations or job situations that pose health hazards. For example, there is a high percentage of Hispanic women who are sewing machine operators, of Asian American women who electrical assemblers, and Black women who are VDT operators-- all occupations with high potential for injury and constant pressure for performance. Unfortunatley, this not a unique situation for women of color.

Given the overall income level for women of color, it is further understandable that the search for decent, affordable housing, where children are accepted, is difficult. Women of color, therefore, often live in marginally safe neighborhoods, where congestion, pollution, trashing, and rodent/insect infestations are high. Moreover, with the very low buying-power of single heads of households, residences themselves are more often in disrepair, giving occupants more exposure to adverse weather conditions and other health hazards (fires, lead paint, open sewage, etc.)

While there is much emphasis on hardships of women of color who are single heads of households, it should be noted that even among married couples or in two-earner families, the family income level is still quite low. Women of color most often marry and share households with men of color. In the earnings hierarchy, men of color earn the lowest wages among men and somewhat more than white women. For instance, Black men earn $0.72 on the dollar; Hispanic men earn $0.76. Despite that higher earning, men of color are as vulnerable to under-employment, unemployment, and "non"-employment as women of color. They predominate in blue-collar occupations (e.g., garbage collectors, commercial fishers, hunters, laborers, heavy equipment operators) where exposure to weather, pollution, and dangerous conditions are the norm. Consequently, the rigors of job and home are not necessarily <u>greatly</u> improved when women and men of color have dual income households.

Understanding the precarious nature of work and income for Asian American, Black, Native American, Hispanic and other racial/ethnic minority families, the issues of access to child care, educational attainment, leave time, sexual harrassment, pay equity and affirmative action take on tremendous significance. While success on one issue alone will not be a panacea to the ills of women of color workers, each advancement will made significant improvement in life. For example, achieving pay

equity in occupations where women of color are concentrated could imporve take-home pay from 5.7% to 37.8%.

Providing accessible, affordable child care could also improve the take-home pay situation. Of the 60.5% of women with children (under age 18) in the work force, it is estimated that about 1/2 are women of color. With low-buying power, these mothers must find no-cost ways of caring for their young children or sacrifice a portion of their already slim paycheck to a caretaker. If women of color can not afford quality care and must improvise or leave children in unsatisfactory conditions, then they are more likely to jeopardize their job in worry over the children or to see to their needs from afar (i.e., checking up and supervising by phone, leaving work to travel across town to meet closing/opening hours, or relinquishing care of young children to grandparents or others outside of the mother's home or even her city).

The link between teen pregnancy and educational attainment is an increasingly worrisome one. Teen girls having babies leave school at alarming rates. Once they have dropped out, the chances of returning to gain a GED or continue high school studies and beyond are woefully diminished. Without adequate education, women of color are triply handicapped in trying to secure a good-paying job with some future and upward mobility. It has been known for some years that women with college degrees earn less than men with an 8th grade education; in 1985, that fact had not significantly changed. What chance, then, have women of color without a high school diploma? Because the obvious answer is extremely little chance, stategies for helping women of color earn degress are as important as strategies for helping to earn more money.

CONCLUSIONS

Women of color are a major part of the U.S. work force yet experience the worse aspects of participation. Therefore, the National Institute for Women of Color recommends the following actions to this Committee:

1) Requests to Federal agencies under the jurisdiction of this for relevant data on women of color, insisting on long-term comparability studies to evaluate the improvement or decline of workforce status among women of color;

2) Staff analysis of pending reform legislation (such as Welfare Reform and Child Care) for impact on the work options of women of color --separately and as a whole;

3) Public support for legislation and its enforcement, includ-ing oversight hearings, which would improve the overall situation for women of color, such as legislation to increase the minimum wage;

4) Encourage programs/actions which are based upon the reality of situations, not upon myths and stereotypes;

5) Design and fully implement programs for the working poor, incluing programs that focus upon preventing economic dependency.

Unless and until the particular needs of women of color are addressed --from development of a statistical base to implementation of strategies for equity and support-- women of color will continue to be a disproportionate percentage of the working and want-to-work poor. The problem has already reached epidemic proportions but we fail to recognize it because women of color aren't being counted.

Unless and until it is recognized that women of color have been and will continue to be a part of the work force, and that the families of women of color depend upon the income of women to survive, we will continue to endanger the future of millions of families and communities. When we look to the future of this country, we can not ignore the Hispanic, Black, Asian, Pacific, and Native American youth who are now growing up in the poverty of single-parent households. In the next 12-15 years, their numbers could swell the prisons, public assistance rolls, unemployment offices, shelters for homeless and battered --or their numbers could swell the next generation of leaders, creators, workers, tax payers. The choice is ours.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Ms. Lee.

I was going to beat Steve Gunderson to the points today, and he left again.

Yesterday he raised the issue of homemakers, that people—let me phrase this right because I do not want to put words in his mouth. But it seems like I raised the issue that so many times when we are looking for equity and for people to be treated equally as our Constitution says they should be, that people have a tendency to term this special interest and put a negative focus on it, such as all of this movement for equity for women is just a women's movement and is divisive.

And later on Mr. Gunderson brought up the point that so many people in the women's lib movement tend to downgrade or degrade women that are just homemakers. And one of your statements, Ms. Holtzman, was the prestige that homemakers in the eyes of today's society have. We have recognized their contribution to the family unit, and the success of people in that family unit is so great that we can no longer look at homemakers as people to be taken for granted and people that do not have a true value connected to them.

I know there have been movements by women's organizations to establish the value of homemakers, so that people understand.

So, I would like you to respond really to the idea that somehow or another in some people's minds in order to maybe place a negative focus on providing equity or equality, they tend to look for a negative focus and say, well, this is why they are doing something and to really deemphasize it. Would you comment on that?

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, the question raises so many interesting issues. I will try to be very brief.

First, I wish the Constitution did require equality for all people. It still has not, despite our celebration of its 200th anniversary, included women as equals under law. And I hope that that will happen sooner rather than later.

But I think the point that Secretary of Commerce Juanita Krebs raised and that I raised here is that the contribution of women, whether it is the home or outside the home, has traditionally been devalued despite all of the rhetoric. You see it nowhere in the gross national product, although we could not survive as a society without the contribution of women in the home. And indeed, if the work of women at home were paid for, it would be very, very expensive indeed. But this is just another aspect of the devaluation of women's contribution in fact.

And those people who detract the effort of equal rights, well, I guess there will always be those who are opposed to human efforts for liberty and freedom, whether it is for women or Polish people or blacks in South Africa or whatever. We cannot let them stand in our way.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you.

You know, I have to comment that yesterday I commented on the fact that I always considered the Constitution a near perfect document, not necessarily that the interpreters of it were near perfect, and in fact, that the amendments, as they took place, were brought about by those people that wished to clarify, as report language in a bill does, the intent of that Constitution because al-

though the Preamble lays it out, there are some people that choose to focus on one aspect of the Preamble in determining how we make a more perfect union.

I commented yesterday that on the floor several Members were talking about Philadelphia and the celebration of the Constitution that was taking place there. And one of our members of the black caucus facetiously, in a joking way, commented that the Constitution did not include us. Well, I think it included all of us. It was just that there were interpreters of it that did not include us. And the amendments to the Constitution have gone a long ways to make sure that we were all included.

You know, women's suffrage and eventually the right for women to vote in 1924 was the evolution of what was prescribed for the perfect document but not interpreted by people carrying out the mandate of it.

We know as late as the early 1950s was when the most indigenous people in this country, the Indian, got the right to vote in the State of New Mexico, which was always inherent in that Constitution but was not granted him until there was ratification of it by that last state.

So, we are working. And the document itself provides us with the opportunity to evolve to a better democracy. Hopefully, we will continue to.

Let me ask you in regards to that situation that you have where you have corrected a long and grave injustice in your agency. How do we get people to change their attitudes without it taking a woman's place in that position to be able to do it?

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Well, Mr. Chairman, it may not be possible to do it without having more women in places to be able to make those kinds of changes.

And perhaps to respond even more specifically to the question you raised at the beginning, I want to make it clear that in my view the objective of the women's movement is to revalue the contribution of women in this society whether it is a contribution at home or outside the home and to look at women as full human beings in whatever task they undertake.

But Mr. Chairman, I think that the question you raise is a very profound one I think because it should not require to be in a position as a boss or as an executive to be able to make the changes to eliminate discrimination and to give other women an opportunity. And in my case it was not only women, but it was minorities in general who also suffered from exactly the same kind of discriminatory attitudes.

I think that partly it will come about through education which has to start in our schools, and partly it has to come about through vigorous enforcement of the anti-discrimination laws that are on our books and that are not being adequately enforced. And this administration itself has created a hostile attitude towards it.

And I think the other way it can be done is for the Congress itself and for government itself, to the extent it possibly can, to set an example. I think Congresswoman Snowe very aptly suggested a number of ways in which the Congress itself could help to set an example for the rest of the country in its own employment practices. And I think these are things that can help make a difference.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Some of us in the Congress have signed the pledge for pay equity among our employees. Not all Members of Congress have. I think every member of this panel has.

Dr. Handler, you have a theme which I very much buy onto, and that is education. Education is a way up and out of poverty. And you can never stress enough how much education can help a person.

But some of the people that we are trying to help somehow do not seem to realize it themselves. And it seems to me that there is something more than just emphasizing education that we must do. From your perspective what are those things that we might need to do? One, you say discouragement is a problem. Well, there are two forms of discouragement: one, self-inflicted discouragement; the other, discouragement from someone outside ourselves, some other body or some institution.

And I think we have got to change. Vigorous enforcement of our civil rights laws, as Ms. Holtzman has indicated, is one way to stop some entity from discriminating against someone when in many cases the person comes from a perspective of a self-defeating situation anyway.

So, what do we have to do to make sure that beside the vigorous enforcement of our laws to stop entities from discouraging students? What do we have to do to make people stop discouraging themselves?

Dr. HANDLER. I take your question, Congressman Martinez, in terms of education.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Yes.

Dr. HANDLER. And I pointed to at least two ways in which—through partnerships with the Federal Government and the schools and the home and with business, we can put programs into place that supplant—not supplant, but add to the Headstart initiatives that have already been taken which clearly show young girls, people of color or children of color that there is an opportunity for them out there which, in fact, produces an aspiration in them that becomes a reality through a support system from the earliest years that they are able to absorb it into the schools through Headstart and programs similar to that in the elementary schools, and most particularly continuation of that mentoring and substantial support system into the junior high schools.

I think that the discouragement that young children feel when for instance their aspirations are elevated and then substantially shattered when they do not make it by virtue of not buying into the system in the junior high schools, dropping out of high schools, or even finishing high schools, but not formalizing their education at higher levels and entering this so-called technological society that we live in can be cut short for many. And we can supplant a negativism with a positivism if indeed we provide for them opportunities of support systems.

Now, if the home does not provide a clear-cut road to higher education and, in fact, to completion of high school, then it must come from without. And the best way to get to the largest numbers is through the school systems. But the school systems in their present mode without additional help cannot not do it alone.

So, private business partnerships, along with the Federal Government, and various programs that suit the community—and I emphasize that because no one, single program suits all communities. Urban is different from a small town, and certainly very different from rural scattered populations. But there are ways, and they have been shown to work.

I think what it needs is putting the will of the Congress, the will of the people—join them in some way. And I plead for enlightened self-interest because I believe that is the best way you can get anybody to do anything. If it is going to mean something for me personally, I will try to get it accomplished. So, it is persuading those who would not think that this is the route that they wish to go.

Can I comment on a question you asked District Attorney Holtzman?

Mr. MARTINEZ. Surely.

Dr. HANDLER. It is this question of who is going to persuade people if there are no women in positions.

I have long thought that the best advocates sometimes for women are men. And I have seen in my own instance that opportunities that I have had have been afforded to me by enlightened males. And I think that unless we enlighten the male population also through educational processes from early on, there is very little hope that there will be sufficient numbers of women in power to do the job as completely as it needs to be done.

And I think somehow you have to advocate a position that you want to have happened by individuals who are themselves not either of people of color or women. And unless you can persuade sufficient numbers of people that they must help you to promote the rights of women who are not themselves women, then you will not be able to make the changes that are required to be made.

Mr. MARTINEZ. I agree with you.

Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HAWKINS. I regret that I could not listen to the witnesses. However, I have had an opportunity to read Dr. Handler's statement. And I am very much impressed with the intriguing idea of the Career Beginnings that was described. It seems to have arisen out of the commonwealth fund in New York City, as I scanned through the statement. And yet, it operates on a national basis. Is that true?

Dr. HANDLER. That is true, in 24 localities. And it is managed by Dr. Andy Hahn at the Heller School at Brandeis University.

Mr. HAWKINS. Does it have any other funding that is outside of the commonwealth fund in New York?

Dr. HANDLER. Yes. It currently receives local funding from some of the communities in which it is located. And this why I referred to it as a public—you know, as a partnership with the——

Mr. HAWKINS. How does it operate? Let us assume that——

Dr. HANDLER. I wish I could give you exactly——

Mr. HAWKINS [continuing]. It is in some other state.

Dr. HANDLER. Yes.

Mr. HAWKINS. And you select students.

Dr. HANDLER. Well, a high school has to be receptive. And the individual school structure is receptive and recruits the mentors for the young people.

And the selection of students, as I pointed out earlier, and made clear in the testimony is that we are not in those programs looking for the highest achievers. We are looking for students who are achieving what you call the average level or maybe slightly underachieving.

Mr. HAWKINS. Is there any participation in funds then if it——

Dr. HANDLER. Yes, of the business community.

Mr. HAWKINS. I see.

Dr. HANDLER. And to the degree that the high schools provide the support structure from the locality in the high schools.

Mr. HAWKINS. I assume there is no Federal funding involved.

Dr. HANDLER. No.

Mr. HAWKINS. Would it be desirable?

Dr. HANDLER. It would be desirable I think to engage more high schools or more local school districts. If they had more resources to devote, then you could get the partnerships of matching funds with business and with the local constituencies more firmly established. Not all institutions or local, whether they be municipalities or school boards, have sufficient breadth and flexible dollars to provide the kind of infrastructure in terms of counseling and teaching that some manage to provide. And there is not the enlightenment in all school districts that there is in some.

So, it would be desirable—at least the seed money to begin such programs across the Nation. And they are not I think that expensive. But, sir, I could not put a dollar amount on it for you at this time.

Mr. HAWKINS. Well, has it been demonstrated that these students selected perform academically well in a four year institution?

Dr. HANDLER. Yes. The early three years of this program, when it was begun in New York City and then extended across the Nation, demonstrated that these students then went on to achieve, and I think graduated from institutions of higher education.

And it is our hope that this next step in this project will demonstrate that more than adequately. And there is every indication to assess this because during the summer months, these students are working instead of engaging in less, shall I say, desirable activities. They are being afforded jobs. They are afforded mentors, monthly meetings with mentors, being encouraged by their school principals and their teachers, and they are beginning to achieve at somewhat higher and higher levels academically, and are sufficiently trained to enter into the higher education system.

Mr. HAWKINS. Well, there are many other questions I would like to ask. The time is limited, but I will try to avail myself of other questions subsequent to the hearing.

Dr. HANDLER. Mr. Hawkins, if you would like, I could make available to you—and I will do so—fuller reports of this program, which is funded by a commonwealth fund and which we now monitor and manage, so that you will be able to with dollar amounts assess the value of perhaps participating through legislation in this kind of endeavor. But I will make certain that Dr. Hahn delivers to you, and with some additional commentary, a full description.

Mr. HAWKINS. All right. Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We will allow the record to remain open so that there can be written questions submitted to the panel if the panel is agreeable. And we can get the response and still make it a part of the record and any other information that we might be able to obtain.

Mr. Owens.

Mr. OWENS. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to begin by welcoming my district attorney from Brooklyn. And as you heard, she is doing a magnificent job in her present career. But I want to state that I am one fan of hers from the Watergate hearings who missed her in the Iran-contragate hearings. I was disappointed by a lot of things that took place in those hearings, especially the fact that the witnesses were allowed to use them as platforms to sell their ideas. I think somehow if they had had a different set of people, it would not have happened.

But former Congresswoman Holtzman, our district attorney, is doing a magnificent job in her present capacity as a good district attorney, but as you heard, in the area of moving the system to do the kinds of things they should be doing with respect to providing equal opportunities for women. She is also doing that.

What she did not talk about is the fact that she does the same kind of thing in terms of equal opportunities for all ethnic groups in her office.

What disturbs me, Liz, is the fact that you were asked a question of what would happen if you had not been there. We are glad that you were there. We are glad there are more women in various decision making positions in government. But I am very disturbed by the fact that you are not talking about a backwater community somewhere. You are talking about the beachhead of liberalism, New York City. And that in New York City you found a situation where systemic discrimination against women has been practiced and was accepted as the norm. I wonder if the government at every level is doing its job.

Is there anything more that can be done by government, realizing the fact that we are having difficulties here on the Hill at this point getting the Civil Rights Restoration Act passed and we cannot offer any immediate, new relief?

But the laws that are on the books now—are they being used sufficiently to guarantee that no situation like that could exist in a major city agency? And if it exists there, I am sure it exists elsewhere. It goes on and on. And the only relief is that individuals may bring court cases themselves. They must take the initiative. They must risk being fired and the things that go along with individuals being in cases related to discrimination.

Under present law, is there no way the government cannot be held responsible for taking the initiative to do more, the attorney general at the state level or the U.S. attorney, when situations like that exist? Is there no initiative that can be taken using the resources of government?

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Congressman Owens, let me say first that this must be a mutual admiration society because I have long admired the record that you established as a state senator in New York and the outstanding job you have done as a Member of Congress. And we are all fortunate not only in Brooklyn and New York City, but in the Nation to have you sit here.

The issue you raised has troubled me very deeply, and it is a point that Dr. Handler made too, that we cannot have enough women in positions of power or authority to begin to make the changes to end discrimination. What do we do about it?

I think the enforcement of the laws is terrible. For example, we are required to submit forms every year indicating our hiring practices. But I am not sure anybody ever takes a look at them. And they surely could never have taken a look at them before I became district attorney because there were no women out of a very large office in positions of authority. But does anybody question? I believe not. I don't think there is any systematic—there may be reporting requirements, but I am not sure there is any systematic review or any kind of random checking of it.

I just think that the anti-discrimination laws that are on the books largely are unenforced except when people complain. And if they do complain about it, then perhaps there may be some investigation. But I think it is a very bad system, obviously, to rely on someone complaining because let's take a young woman in my office who has been an attorney there for 10 years, who has done an outstanding job, has been extremely talented, has won many cases, has demonstrated her professional capacity very well, and has been passed over for 10 years for all promotions. If she goes to complain about the situation, she may lose all opportunity for promotion in the future. So, you have a tremendous inhibition against these women bringing a complaint to begin with.

The same things happen with the court. Women, whether they are witnesses or attorneys, who enter the courts can be mistreated by judges or opposing counsel. But many times, especially when it is the judge who will demean the woman attorney, she will not complain because she will say, well, I have to appear before this judge again. And so, am I going to risk my financial future to protect my own personal dignity? It is a terrible choice to put human beings into.

And I think one of the ways of resolving it is much more vigorous enforcement of the simple anti-discrimination laws that are on the books.

And I think you made an excellent point, and I alluded to it briefly, that the discrimination against women, if it exists, is probably not there by itself. You will also find discrimination against minorities, against blacks, against Hispanics. Not only did I find discrimination against women when I became DA, but in my office in Brooklyn, one of the bureaus completely excluded all blacks. This is in 1981. There as not a black attorney who would be allowed to work in that bureau and not a black clerical staff. No one, no black.

To me this is inconceivable that this could happen, but it seems to me that one of the ways of dealing with it is better enforcement of the laws.

Of course, I mentioned education. I think that is important, but before we have enough enlightened people, if we start educating them now, it will be 40 years before they are in a position to make a difference. And I think we have got to do something in the interim, as well as educating people.

Mr. OWENS. I was also quite shocked by the statement you made that the police dispatch people who handle the phone calls, mostly women, are underpaid to the tune of $8,000 compared to their counterparts in the fire department, who with all due respect to them, they have a much easier job. I wonder where do unions come in in that kind of situation. How does that go on and continue?

Ms. HOLTZMAN. I am sorry. I did not hear the question.

Mr. OWENS. The discrepancy of $8,000 between two obvious positions doing obviously the same thing except the women in the police department have a much more stressful load.

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Right.

Mr. OWENS. And I just wondered how that persists, you know. I thought we had taken care of pay equity problems in New York City. I did not know we still had problems.

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Part of the reason it persists, Congressman Owens, is because New York City itself has refused to undertake, for example, a comparable worth study. That is something that the major has been objecting to for a very long time.

Congress itself, as I gather from Congresswoman Snowe's remarks, has not done that either. Perhaps this is an area in which Congress can begin to set an example by doing that here and by either through the carrot or the stick requiring other governmental units and others to take a look at comparable worth issues. I do not think that this is really an issue of comparable worth. I think you see the same people doing exactly the same job and they are not paid the same amount of money.

It is an outrageous situation, but unless we have better laws on the books or more vigorous enforcement of the laws, many times there is no incentive. And the press won't report about it because just as I mentioned to Chairman Martinez earlier how women's work is devalued, discrimination against women is not seen as a particularly important issue, and that is not going to be on the front page. So, issues like this are generally buried. The public does not understand and there is very little public clamor, therefore, for the kinds of changes that have to be made.

Mr. OWENS. Thank you.

Dr. Handler, I want to thank you and congratulate you on your very intent and impassioned statement on a subject which is very close to my heart and I have spent a lot of time studying, the fact that the upper part of the educational pipeline for blacks, both females and males, is diminishing. The number of people in that pipeline is steadily decreasing instead of increasing as it should.

I must congratulate the higher education community. When we were considering the extension of the Higher Education Assistance Act last year and proposed that special efforts be made to save the black colleges, 105 black colleges in the Nation out of 3,000 higher education institutions, thanks to the wisdom and the generosity of the total higher education community, and we got cooperation in doing that.

On the other hand, we recognize that 80 percent of blacks are attending predominantly white institutions. And one of the big issues has been the kind of treatment they have been receiving on the campuses and recent violence on those campuses has been traced back to a notion and a myth that is being perpetrated that

black students are getting everything. You know, the aid money and the changes in loan policies and a number of hardships that white students are suffering now is as a result of black students getting everything.

Can you comment on that at all?

Dr. HANDLER. I think you are right in that it plays a role in attitudes. It is unfortunate because obviously it is so false. I think that there are aid programs, whether it starts with the Pell grants and different financial programs for all students.

Mr. OWENS. Do you know of any place where we can get some documentation on how false it is? Has anybody done any work on the question?

Dr. HANDLER. There is no question. I do not have it at my fingertips, but I have seen all the figures that are available. Certainly on our campuses aid is distributed on the basis of need, and as many white students as non-whites or students of color receive financial aid that is both government derived and which we raise at our institution for all of our students. And I think that that would be easily available to you, Congressman Owens, and I will be again very happy to go back to the higher education community and make certain that you receive that data. A few phone calls should provide that for you with no difficulty whatsoever. And I will call the president of ACE and make sure that you get that data.

Mr. OWENS. I appreciate that. That's a little item that we dealt with in the——

Dr. HANDLER. This is a very major item in terms of false perceptions.

Mr. OWENS. Another item we dealt with in the passage of the Higher Education Assistance Act related to requiring that one-half of the students—or that priority be assigned with respect to Pell grants or student work assignments to students who were the first generation of their family to attend college. I would be interested in knowing how that has worked out, what has been the result of that.

I do not necessarily mean that will end up having more minority students.

Dr. HANDLER. Let me see if I can——

Mr. OWENS. But there are probably a number of white families in the same situation.

Dr. HANDLER. Well, I can comment, you know, from general experience back at the time when I was at the City University. And you know, so much to-do was made about open admissions at that time and who would benefit from it. And you know the data as well as I know the data that it was clearly shown that the staggering numbers of majority students, if you will permit me, or white students at that time, entered the system when open admissions was put into effect, and that the overwhelming numbers that entered the City University were, in fact, not people of color or minorities, but rather the majority students although they were distributed in interesting ways in the colleges. And that is another story.

I think in making students comfortable on the campus and passions that arise—they are quite unique and different and distinct for the campus involved. And it would be foolhardy to draw conclu-

sions that all campuses are alike and that all campuses have negative attitudes towards people of color. But I think from a few negative incidents, it does spread like wildfire in terms of both perceptions and the media and stories. And I think in general that most institutions are making strides and trying very hard to recruit students to their campus and make them feel comfortable.

Mr. OWENS. Thank you. I also want to congratulate you for sounding the alarm for black female students. We in the black community are very alarmed about the fact that male students are decreasing, the number is decreasing at such an alarming rate, but it is almost as bad with females. And I am glad to hear you point that out.

Ms. Lee, I did want to ask you a question if the Chairman would be so gracious as to let me ask one more question considering I did not use time——

Mr. MARTINEZ. I'll yield part of my time.

Ms. LEE. May I first also comment on your request for information from Dr. Handler on data collection——

Mr. OWENS. Yes.

Ms. LEE [continuing]. On those kinds of statistics. From my own professional background when I had to do that in a major urban city here in the country recently, looking at the issue of minority access to higher education in an urban area, in talking to 15 universities both two and four year college and university institutions in that city, what I found was that there was a very wide spectrum of data that was available, statistical information on who was recruited, who was enrolled, what were the levels of retention and who graduated.

And that had to do very distinctly with the level of enforcement that is now prevalent throughout the country within the Department of Education that is required that some institutions were very good at keeping that data up to date. Other institutions were not, that it was very difficult to get that information. And I think that is true of getting data on minority participation both in education and in the work force and work place. And as a policymaker——

Mr. OWENS. That is the question I was going to ask you. You said before that data is not collected——

Ms. LEE. That's right.

Mr. OWENS [continuing]. In the case of——

Ms. LEE. And then it just limits in terms of both advocates and policymakers. You cannot make good policy without a good information base, and I would just like to encourage and reinforce that. As you look at it, that is to me a very appropriate role for congressional oversight committees to look at what the Federal agencies do in their own data collection efforts.

Mr. OWENS. Thank you.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Mr. Owens.

Mr. Hayes.

Mr. HAYES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

At least I will not have to engage my colleague in a discussion over his characterization of New York as being the beachhead of liberalism because I think part of the answer came out in Attorney

Holtzman characterization, the revelation of the difference in salary within the fire department.

But I do want to say that testimony of all three witnesses has been excellent.

I wish it were possible, Dr. Handler, you would have the opportunity—I know it is a vain wish—to just site some of the statistics revealing the current problem as it relates to the education of blacks to members of my party, the Democratic party, so they would understand it, the kind of serious situation——

Dr. HANDLER. Sir, if you invite me, I would be happy to do it.

Mr. HAYES. I wish I had the power. You would be there tomorrow if a forum could be set because I feel that you are on target in focusing attention on this problem as it relates to blacks.

When you say, for example, on page 5, "The feeling among blacks these days is that they are no longer welcome on college campuses," I think this is true.

This may explain why some black young people regard academic success as socially unacceptable. As one black student put it, studying for exams and doing well in courses is whitey's way. That is the way many of them express it.

And when you along with that say that the numbers of blacks and minorities is growing in our society and there ought to be some focus on how can we turn the things around from the direction they are now going and begin to concentrate in the area where help is so greatly needed in the education for the present and coming generation. More needs to be said and publicized about the seriousness of this situation.

And you mentioned—although you did not call it creaming, but that is what you meant. There is more creaming now when it comes to the selection of students who are going to be exposed to the opportunity to get higher education. This begins, as you say, at the elementary level all the way into the post secondary level. And these children are future leaders and we are overlooking in many instances those who have the potential who we are not willing to work and concentrate on these studies.

And I think you are on target, as the other two witnesses here, in focusing attention in this direction. And as a member of this committee and one who represents a district—I know it is redundant for me to say it to some who might have heard it before. I represent a district where the dropout ratio among blacks at the high school level is better than 50 percent now in the City of Chicago. It is a crime to see what is happening to many of our kids.

And the reason—for this neglect is economic. Some is lack of interest. But I think we in the Congress have got to begin to address ourselves to these kinds of problems. It is not the question of just the kids. It is the future of this great Nation of ours that is at stake. The best security to this country can ever have is to invest in educating our youth. And we do not seem to realize that.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Mr. Hayes.

Mr. Jontz.

Mr. JONTZ. Mr. Chairman, I have no questions, but I do want to thank each of the witnesses for the excellent statements and associate myself with the comments of my colleagues here about the importance of these matters for our consideration. Thank you.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you.

In closing this panel, let me take a moment to say that Mr. Gunderson yesterday pointed out that in fact on this committee there is only one woman, and she is on the Republican side. Let me say that I would admonish the Chairman to next year recruit one of our Democratic women colleagues to be on our side of the aisle.

And he was also going to bring out the fact that on the panel for Iranscam, or whatever you want to call it, that there are no women. And he was quick to point that out. The Democrats had no women. Well, we selected our side, and it is a tragedy that there are no women. But they have choices too on the Republican side, and they didn't choose any women either.

Thank you all for appearing before us.

Our next panel consists of Ms. Helen Blank, Director of Child Care, Children's Defense Fund; George, Engelter, member of the National Legislative Committee, American Association of Retired Persons; and Ms. Diana Pearce, Director of Women and Poverty Project; Ms. Anne Moss, Director of Women's Pension Project, Pension Rights Center.

Mr. MARTINEZ. With that, we will begin with Ms. Blank. And I understand that you have a time problem. We would allow you then to give your testimony and ask quick question of each of the panel, and then allow you to leave.

STATEMENT OF HELEN BLANK, DIRECTOR OF CHILD CARE, CHILDREN'S DEFENSE FUND

Ms. BLANK. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, before I start, we really at the Children's Defense Fund, I would like to say, appreciate this committee's deep interest in children and commitment to building strong child care programs. We worked closely with you on improving the child care provisions of the welfare reform bill, and we think given the circumstances, that you have produced a good start for children. Obviously, we all know we need to move further. But the Education and Labor Committee has always understood the kind of resources you have to invest to provide decent child care. And we look forward to working with you in the future.

Obviously child care—and you have heard from other witnesses—is an enormous problem in this country. The demand far exceeds the need. We have had mothers go to work in record numbers And the child care system that they need is simply not there. All families must sort through a patchwork system to find child care. Many communities now have what we call resource and referral programs to help families, but many communities have no such programs. And all mothers have to turn to are the Yellow Pages. All families, regardless of income, face a tremendous supply issue. The situation is particularly critical for infants and toddlers because nearly 50 percent of mothers of children under 1 are now in the work force.

We recently did a survey of hospital-based child care programs for hospital employees. And 110 out of 400 responded. They had 1,500 infants being served, but they had almost 3,000 on waiting lists. And directors wrote painful stories of turning parents away.

What happens is not only do parents accept less than they should for their children, they move young children back and forth all day. A New York City study of child care found that more than half the parents had made multiple child care arrangements.

One reason child care is so hard to find is the child care workers earn poverty level wages. As a result, the turnover rate is 42 percent. Programs cannot find workers, and young children face a multiplicity of care givers in a single day.

The cost is obviously expensive. It is $3,000 per child on the average now. And as other witnesses have testified, we have many, many low income families who cannot afford child care. In 1984 one-fifth of husbands heading two parent families and two-thirds of women heading single parent families were low wage earners.

We think that three new issues are also propelling this countries interest in child care and make it imperative that we move to be bold and to address the child care crisis in this country.

The first is an issue that you all looked at last week. It is welfare reform. We have many opinions on how welfare has to be fixed. But we are seeing very little disagreement that mothers, who are low income, cannot go to work unless child care is provided. Every day a new study comes across my desk—they are included in my testimony—that show the single most important reason that mothers cannot go to work and be self-sufficient or participate in a training program is the lack of child care at a reasonable cost.

We can open up new funding for child care and welfare reform, but we found we cannot improve child care for all low income families and make some improvements we need for all families on a welfare reform bill.

We are also seeing—and I believe this is fueling interest in child care—a new interest in basic skills. We are finding that we have a shrinking youth population. The young people between the ages of 16 and 24 made up 24 percent of the population in 1978. By 1995, they are going to make up 18 percent of the population. If we are going to remain competitive, we cannot lose any of our young people.

Where do we start? This committee has long recognized we start in programs like Headstart. The Governors Association, Fortune Magazine, the Committee on Economic Development agree now, and they say that for poor youngsters the place to begin to build the foundation for basic skills is an early childhood development program.

However, young children who are poor have half the chance of participating in these programs than upper income children. And 67 percent of 4 year olds of parents who earn $35,000 a year or more are enrolled in preschool programs. Yet, only 33 percent of 4 year olds whose families earn $10,000 or less are enrolled in these programs.

My testimony talks about the key linkage between basic skills and employment and dropouts. We have done a recent publication on new data by Dr. Andrew Sum at Brandeis. We must start when children are very young to help them build this foundation.

A third factor that is fueling interest in child care is increasing middle class dissatisfaction with child care arrangements. There have been a number of studies. A recent Fortune Magazine study

looked at 400 working mothers and fathers with children under 12. They found that the dissatisfaction with child care was the most reliable predictor for absenteeism and unproductive work time.

An AFSCME study found that many parents were uncomfortable about the quality of their child care arrangements. In some cases the ramifications are greater than increased or reduced productivity. We all shared the terrible tragedy in Florida last December. A young mother was on the waiting list for child care in that state, a waiting list that has now climbed to 26,400 families in one state. She had to go to work. She had what many policymakers say is what families should do, a cousin, a relative, makeshift child care arrangements. A cousin could not come. She did not want to leave her job. Maurice and Anthony, who were 3 and 4, were left home alone. They crawled into the dryer, a seemingly cozy place, and these two young boys burned to death.

A judge in Miami called people who do not want to fund these programs that would have helped Maurice and Anthony, child abusers. We agree with them.

We found another Miami mother who has not faced a tragedy yet. But she puts her two nine month old twins in the bathroom, locked in a playpen so she can go to work.

We face a challenge now. Our challenge is to take these concerns and weave them into a policy that makes sense for children and families.

The Children's Defense Fund, along with 60 other national organizations, have launched a major campaign to foster such a policy. We have joined together in the alliance for better child care. Our group represents women's groups, education groups, religious groups, church groups, professionals. The goal is to pass a major, new Federal child care initiative that will help low income families pay for care and improve the quality of care for all families.

We believe the time is right. Polls are saying that more Americans believe that increased funds must go into child care.

Why the Federal Government? We think we are not going to move ahead unless the Federal Government becomes an equal partner. For the last five years at CDF, we have been chronicling state child care developments. We see an uneven picture.

If you live in Massachusetts where you still have gaps, you see enormous new resources in child care. If you are an Alabama or a Georgia or a Louisiana parent, you can't vote and move to Massachusetts, you face a crisis. In Georgia there are 76,000 children needing care, 8,000 receiving it, and that state cut child care by 37 percent last year.

California is moving ahead, has always been, but they serve less than 10 percent of the million children who need child care.

There has been a recent study of public housing child care projects. They found 96,000 children on the waiting list.

State governments cannot do it alone. The private sector is the place where many of us have been focusing our efforts. Employers will do it. Let's be honest. There are 3 million employers, and only about 6,000 do something about child care. On-site child care centers are mostly in hospitals who have trouble recruiting nurses. We would have never asked employers to cover our whole health care system. We have a Medicaid program. We still have 37 million fam-

ilies who have no health insurance. Employers can play a bigger role, but they cannot be asked to do it by themselves.

At the Federal level, all we have for direct child care services is the Title XX social services block grant; 18 percent of that goes for child care. That block grant is $600 million less than if it had not been cut in 1981. But when we factor in inflation, it is half of what it was a decade ago.

We have with this committee's help passed a few minor child care initiatives in the last few years. I think some of them are too small to even be called modest. We have provided a million dollars to help care givers improve their credentials by earning a child development associate degree. We have added some money to help communities start, but not operate school age child care programs, so low income families have no funds to use these programs. We have added some child care authorization to the Higher Education Act. Good steps, but not enough.

The Federal Government cannot shirk its role anymore either in for helping families pay for care or helping to insure that their care is good.

We still have some states that let one care giver care for seven babies. My 13 year old baby-sits a lot. We sit at the dinner table and talk about how many children she can take care of. And she goes, one, two. I don't think I could take care of three, Mom. Well, in North Carolina they are asked to take care of seven and some days eight.

We hope to have legislation ready to be introduced this fall. The final details are being hammered out. We know that many groups and people across the country are anxious and waiting. It is not a small bill, but seeing the enormous crisis we face, we feel it is time to be bold and lay out what this country needs to address its child care dilemma. We are fooling ourselves, but we are doing worse. We are providing an enormous disservice to our children. We are threatening the future productivity and competitiveness of our country, the safety of our youngsters, if we do not move ahead and deal with child care in the way that we have to deal with it.

Thank you.

[Prepared statement of Helen Blank follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HELEN BLANK, DIRECTOR, CHILD CARE, CHILDREN'S DEFENSE FUND, WASHINGTON, DC

There is a new sense of urgency about child care issues. This sense of urgency is well founded. By 1995, two thirds of all preschool age children or nearly 15 million children will have a mother in the workforce. This will represent a 50 percent increase over the 1985 figure of 9.6 million children. Mothers are working out of economic necessity. A 1983 New York Times poll indicated that "for 71 percent of mothers who work the primary reason was not for something interesting to do but, to support their family."

- Between 1967 and 1985, wives' contributions to family income increased from 10.6 percent to 18 percent for white families, from 19.4 percent to 30 percent for black families with children and from 14.4 percent to 20 percent for Hispanic families with children.
- On the average the income of two parent families, dropped 3.1 percent between 1973 and 1984. This decrease would have been more than three times larger, 9.5 percent, if mothers had not increased their workforce participation and earnings.
- In 1985, 45 percent of the mothers of newborn children worked in clerical and sales jobs, 31 percent in service blue collar jobs, and only 24 percent in higher paying professional jobs.

The reawakening of interest in child care is due, to a heightened understanding of the central role that child care plays in America's economic security--present and future. Our challenge is to translate this new attention into public policy which supports our families and prepares our children for rich and productive lives. We cannot afford to shirk away from this challenge.

Progress toward a coherent child care policy over the past 15 years has been fragmented and tentative. The steps that have been taken toward meeting the growing child care needs of America's families have, for the most part, been small, hardly enough to make up for the ground lost in 1981 when Congress and the President reduced the Title XX Social Services Block Grant--the largest source of direct federal child care support--by 20 percent, much less enough to keep pace with inflation and rapidly increasing need. Even before the 1981 cuts, Title XX child care programs only served 472,000 of the 3.4 million children living in poverty in 1981. In 1984, there were 4.9 million children in that age group and less money to serve them. Since 1981, the steps taken to address child care at the federal level have been too small to be even termed modest: $5 million dollars allocated to provide start-up funds for school-age child care and resource and referral services, $10 million authorized to help children

who need child care as a respite service and for those in crisis nurseries, $10 million authorized to help low-income college students pay for the care that they need to complete their education, and $1.5 million to help caregivers seeking to improve their skills and earn a Child Development Associate credential.

At the state level, progress is uneven, depending more on the health of each state's economy than on its child care needs. States with stronger economies (such as Massachusetts and New York) are taking positive steps, while states with weaker economies have not only failed to move forward but, worse yet, have moved backwards. Georgia, which provides child care help to only 8,000 out of 76,000 eligible children, reduced its child care budget by 37 percent last year. They, as all of us who have struggled to build a decent child care system, were faced with painful choices. The state did not reduce the number of children who receive child care help but instead lowered already minimal standards for child care and reduced salaries for child care workers.

Even the states that have taken important steps forward have failed to create a sensible pattern of services which are easily accessible to parents. One example is state efforts to develop preschool programs for four year olds. While the growth of early childhood development programs for low income children is a very important goal, it must be correlated with families' child care needs. These new programs, however, while ostensibly seeking to meet the needs of working parents, are only open for a limited number of hours, not a full working day.

A piecemeal approach to meeting the ever growing child care needs of America's families will not provide children and families with the support they need. The time has come for a bold and far-reaching approach to child care.

The need is startling: Child care costs are high, averaging approximately $3,000 a year per child. Yet, in 1984, one fifth of husbands heading two parent families and 2/3 of women heading single parent families were low wage earners. They could not earn enough to meet the yearly poverty income level for a family of four, even if they worked 52 weeks a year. This situation does not promise to improve. Between 1963 and 1978, 27 percent of all new jobs paid less than $8,700 a year in 1984 dollars. From 1978 to 1984, 37 percent of new jobs were in that category.

These families cannot find adequate help in meeting their child care needs:

- Fewer than 10 percent of the 1.1 million eligible California children who are fourteen or younger can be served at the state's current level of child care funding.

- Louisiana, which will reduce child care expenditure by 20 percent this year, already has 9,000 children on the waiting list for state funded child care.

- In 1986, nearly half of Kentucky's counties gave no state funded child care assistance to children of low-income working parents.

- In 1984, only 20,000 of the 300,000 Pennsylvania children in need of subsidized care received it.

- In more than 230 public housing projects with child care centers recently surveyed, there was a waiting list of approximately 96,000 children. Furthermore, surveyors estimated that households with approximately 170,000 children might be interested in the centers' services if care were to be available for a wider range of children for more hours.

- In a new national survey of 600 American families conducted by the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), nearly four out of ten respondents claimed that they cannot afford the service they use or are precluded from using other, more desirable, services by cost.

The need, however, goes beyond affordability. Too many states have failed to enact and enforce basic health and safety protections for children. State child care standards vary widely. In too many cases, standards are so minimal that children's basic health and safety is threatened. The growing number of infants in child care poses a special concern. The National Association for the Education of Young Children, the major membership organization representing early childhood development professionals recommends that no more than three infants should be cared for by one caregiver. This ratio is not difficult to comprehend. Small infants require a great deal of constant attention, including frequent feedings. Yet, only three states (Kansas, Maryland and Massachusetts) require the 1:3 ratio. Seven states allow one caregiver to care for six infants. Two states allow as many as seven and one state (South Carolina) will let one caregiver care for eight infants. When disaster strikes, the consequences can be grim:

- Last November, Tiffany, age 2, and Asif, age 4, were killed when a fire broke out in an unlicensed family day care home in Brooklyn, New York. Six other children were injured. Two of the six children were 11 months old, the others were two and three years old. No caregiver could carry all eight children.

While child care experts believe that the size of a group of children is key to the learning environment, 26 states have no requirements for group size relative to age of children. It is possible, in such a situation, to have 30 three year olds in one room, though the quality of that care is most certainly lowered.

Training of staff is intimately linked to the quality of care yet 20 states have no ongoing training requirements for staff working in child care centers and 35 states do not require training, at all, for family day care home providers. Twenty-two states have no pre-service requirement for teachers in charge of classrooms, nine states do not require directors of child care programs to have any training prior to employment.

Unlimited parental access, the right of a parent to visit their child's program at any time, is a sound concept. While most working parents are unlikely to disrupt a caregiver's schedule, they certainly should have the right to assure their child's basic safety and well being at all times. However, 33 states do not guarantee unlimited parental access for child care centers and 39 states for family day care homes.

Lower quality care has many consequences. A study of abuse and neglect in North Carolina day care programs found that child care centers which met lower standards and were subject to less monitoring were five times as likely to have a serious complaint than programs which met higher standards and received more frequent monitoring. Complaints against unregistered family day care names were three times as likely to be severe as those against registered homes.

The quality of child care is also threatened by the low salaries paid to child care providers. In 1984, 90 percent of private household child care workers and 58 percent of all other child care workers earned less than poverty-level wages. Despite higher levels of education, child care providers are paid less per hour than animal caretakers, bartenders, or parking lot and amusement park attendants, according to the 1980 census. Low salaries hurt the quality of child care available. These salaries make it increasingly difficult to attract those caregivers with the training that enables them to care best for young children. The National Day Care Study, commissioned by the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare in 1976, found that children in child care centers--especially low-income children--make the greatest test score gains when they are with caregivers who have participated in specialized education and training programs. But, child care administrators point out that the wages offered today make such staffing virtually impossible to maintain.

A confluence of circumstances has helped move child care to a priority position on the public policy agenda. Three factors

contribute to the current climate: the Welfare Reform debate, a reawakening of interest in early childhood development programs, and increasing middle class frustration with the lack of quality child care.

There is a broad consensus that the welfare system is fundamentally flawed and must, for the economic health of the nation as well as for that of poor families, be "fixed." This question--how to fix welfare--has fostered heated debate at the state and federal level. However, there is agreement by all players that child care is a critical part of a strategy to move families from poverty and dependence on welfare to self-sufficiency through education, training, and employment. The welfare reform debate has provided a forum in which to publicize the well documented link between the availability of affordable child care and the ability of low-income parents to work. A broader audience is now aware of studies such as the one conducted by the National Social Science and Law Center in 1986 exploring the barriers to employment faced by single mothers receiving welfare benefits in Washington state. Nearly two-thirds of the respondents cited difficulties with child care arrangements as the primary problem in seeking and keeping a job. Seventy-six percent of those women in the survey who had given up looking for work cited child care difficulties as preventing their search for or attainment of employment. A 1982 Census Bureau survey found that 45 percent of single parents and 36 percent of low-income parents would work if child care were available at a reasonable cost.

A recent survey by the Legal Aid Society of Northeastern New York of 101 low income mothers found that more than half of the non-working mothers surveyed and 57 percent of those recently unemployed were not working because of problems finding child care.

Yet another recent report by the GAO: Work and Welfare: Current AFDC Work Programs and Implications for Federal Policy noted that about 60 percent of its AFDC work program respondents said that lack of child care prevented participation. In certain cases, shortage of child care providers seemed to pose major problems in arranging child care for participants work programs, however, states reported spending very little on child care. Child care accounted for only 6.4 percent of the median program's budget.

The lack of child care also prohibits women from working longer hours. Almost 35 percent of women who are working at or looking for part time jobs said they would work longer hours if child care were available.

On the other hand, a public investment in child care has been shown to be cost effective. The Colorado Department of

Social Services has estimated that providing child care assistance to low-income working families costs only 38 percent of what it would cost to provide these same families with AFDC and Medicaid benefits, were they unemployed.

An understanding of these and similar findings has resulted in the inclusion of significant child care provisions in state welfare reform measures--most notably in the Massachusetts ET Program, which commits 50 percent of its total budget to child care for program participants, and in the California GAIN program, which in its first year had a child care budget of six million dollars.

One Louisville, Kentucky mother who has become independent with the help of child care assistance speaks movingly about the rewards:

> "We have a very low income and without child care help, I wouldn't get the training I need to make us a better future and maybe some day help someone else."

Federal welfare reform measures now pending before Congress do include child care policy improvements. However, the child care provisions of welfare reform proposals cannot address the gaps in our current child care system. Those of us concerned with child care understand welfare reform as part of a means to an end. It may result in modest but important policy modifications and funding increases. But, perhaps more significantly, the welfare reform movement has educated policymakers, both public and private, about the role that child care plays in helping lift themselves out of poverty. The welfare debate has prepared the ground for more substantial steps toward a decent child care system.

While the welfare reform debate has helped heighten an understanding of the link between the availability of child care and the ability of low-income parents to move from dependency to self-sufficiency, there is also a broader understanding of the link between high quality child care and preschool programs and our nation's future economic health. High quality preschool or early childhood development programs can provide children, particularly low-income children, with the foundation upon which to build the basic skills that they need to become successful students and eventually productive adults.

Demographic changes, particularly the rapidly declining percentage of young people and children in the population, drive an increased interest in "early investment," which includes high quality preschool programs. Young people between the ages of 16 and 24 made up 27 percent of the population in 1978. By contrast, in 1995, they will account for only 18 percent of the population. As the number of future workers declines, the value

of every individual worker to business and industry increases. Yet, our traditional neglect of children, particularly poor children, imperils their futures and our future as a competitive nation.

- One in four children is poor.
- One in three is non-white, of whom two in five are poor.
- One in five is at risk of becoming a teen parent.
- One in six is in a family in which neither parent has a job.
- One in seven is at risk of dropping out of school.

The need to invest now in young children, to help compensate for past neglect and to help assure a competitive workforce in the future, should and does seem to weigh more heavily on the minds of policymakers. An increasing number of business and government leaders agree that early childhood development programs play a key role in getting children off to a strong start. For example, the Research and Policy Committee of the business-led Committee for Economic Development firmly supports a public investment in such programs for low-income children and finds that the benefits far outweigh the costs. According to the National Governor's Association in its 1986 report Time for Results: The Governors' 1991 Report on Education, quality early childhood programs "reduce the high school dropout rate, increase the college attendance rate, increase employment, and reduce the welfare and crime rate after high school." In an article on America's "underclass" Fortune magazine strongly supported including comprehensive early childhood development programs, such as Head Start, as the child care component of any workfare program.

While all American children could benefit from preschool programs, those who are less well-off have, by far, the most to gain from such programs though they are far less likely to get the chance to participate. In fact, they are less than half as likely. In 1985, fewer than 33 percent of four-year-olds and 17 percent of three-year-olds whose families had incomes of less than $10,000 a year were enrolled in preschool programs, according to Sheila Kamerman and Alfred Kahn of the Columbia School of Social Work. In contrast, 67 percent of four-year-olds and 54 percent of three-year-olds whose families have incomes of $35,000 a year or more attend preschool programs. Poor children are not getting an equal opportunity to participate in the early childhood development programs that they so badly need if they are to have an equal opportunity to build successful academic careers.

A positive early childhood development experience helps low-income children begin school on a footing more even with their more advantaged peers, improving their ability to gain the basic

skills so necessary to their future success. The level of a young person's reading and math skills has a powerful effect on his or her future employment prospects, according to data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Young Americans, analyzed by Dr. Andrew Sum of Northeastern University. Youths who by age eighteen have the weakest basic skills (in the lowest fifth) are between four and seven times more likely to be jobless and out of school in subsequent years than those with above average basic skills. The average poor teenager who is unemployed has basic skills in the bottom fifth relative to his or her age group and poor jobless minority teens, on the average, fall in the lowest tenth of the basic skills distribution for their peers.

Basic skills deficiencies are linked closely to the problems of poverty among children and youths. In large part as a result of the deprivation they experience while growing up, nearly half of all poor youths are concentrated in the bottom fifth of the basic skills rankings of all young Americans. More than three-fourths have below average skills. In their hiring decisions, employers often use a high school diploma as a screening mechanism or proxy for attainment of basic skills. It is not surprising, given the fact that 85 percent of all high school dropouts have below average basic skills, that dropouts are two and a half times more likely to be unemployed than high school graduates. Ironically, as women's labor force participation has increased over the last decade, the likelihood that a black single mother, between the ages of 18 and 34 with two or more children is working has decreased from 34 to 31 percent. A primary reason for the decreased work participation among black women is their high school dropout rate.

Even for youths without diplomas, however, strong basic skills make a difference. Male dropouts with very good basic skills earn nearly twice as much on average as those with very poor skills. They also out-earn male high school graduates with the lowest skill level by roughly 50 percent. The growing awareness of the importance of basic skills, accompanied by an enhanced understanding of the importance that early childhood development programs play in making sure that children are ready to learn basic skills when they enter school, is fostering increased public support not just for child care, but also for high quality child care.

A third factor is emerging to make child care a policy priority: an increasing number of middle income families are expressing dissatisfaction with their child care arrangements. A number of recent studies vividly illustrate that dissatisfaction with child care arrangements or lack of child arrangements adversely affects the productivity of America's working parents. The AFSCME poll found that three in ten parents suffer from fear that the child care that they are able to afford is not of high quality. Fully 28 percent of all working parents interviewed

with children 12 and under had given up a job or a promotion because of the lack of child care. A recent Census Bureau study reported that one in twenty working parents were absent from work in the month previous to the study because of problems with their child care arrangements. A Fortune magazine study of 400 working mothers and fathers with children under 12 also found that dissatisfaction with child care was the most reliable predictor for absenteeism and unproductive work time.

In some cases, the shortage of child care was greater than the ramifications of reduced productivity.

> Linda Grant's two small children, Anthony (age three) and Maurice (age four) died in Dade County, Florida, on November 6, 1986, in an accident that could have been averted had the family had access to child care help. Although Ms. Grant worked to support her family, her income was so low that she could not afford to pay for child care for the two children. Because she qualified for government help, she put her children on Florida's waiting list for child care assistance, a list which then included 22,000 other names.
>
> While she waited for help, Ms. Grant relied on friends and relatives to care for the children. But, some days these arrangements fell through, and the boys were left alone. On one such day, November 6, Maurice and Anthony climbed into the clothes dryer to look at a magazine in a seemingly cozy place, closed the door, and tumbled and burned to death.
>
> After their deaths, the Miami Herald observed that "Anthony and Maurice might be alive today if affordable care had been available." The wait for subsidized day care is eighteen to twenty-four months, because local, state, and federal governments have been unwilling to provide the funds to meet the demand for child care help to low-income families. The Miami News wrote, "There are hundreds, maybe thousands more tragedies waiting to happen in Dade County alone, in every home where young children are left to fend for themselves... They're not latchkey kids, they're lockup kids, locked inside for the day by parents who can't afford day care, can't afford not to work and can't get government assistance..." Dade County Juvenile Court Judge William Gladstone said, "People who don't want to fund these programs are child abusers."

The challenge before us at the local, state, and federal level is to weave various concerns about child care issues together to demonstrate that they are complementary, not competing, concerns and to translate the various concerns into a new national policy.

The Children's Defense Fund, in collaboration with over 60 national organizations, has launched a major campaign to foster such a policy. This collaboration, the Alliance for Better Child Care (ABC), now includes members such as the Child Welfare League of America, the Office of Church and Society of the United Church of Christ, the American Academy of Pediatrics, The National Parent Teacher Association, the American Federation of Teachers, the National Education Association, the Service Employees International Union, the Association of Junior Leagues, and many other religious, women's and children's organizations as well as unions and professional groups. The goal of ABC is to pass a major national child care initiative which would make new funds available to help low and moderate income families meet the cost of child care while, at the same time, providing states with direct funds and financial incentives to improve the quality and expand the supply of child care for all families.

We believe the time for such an initiative is ripe not only for the critical reasons already discussed but also because a growing segment of the American public supports increased public spending for child care. A recent Harris poll found that 73 percent of the respondents would be willing to increase their taxes to pay for child care. ABC news pollsters for the Washington Post found that 57 percent of the respondents felt child care programs should be increased in 1987, as compared to 46 percent in 1986. Finally, 71 percent of the AFSCME respondents said that government should be doing more to supply affordable child care.

The responsibility for the provision of high quality child care services must be shared by many partners. Such a partnership must include all levels of government, the private sector, both nonprofit organizations and employers, and parents. Over the past several years, we have seen many of these players expand their role in the provision of child care.

Some state governments are increasing state dollars committed to child care. Other states have taken similar steps. However, the uneven nature of the states' child care policies makes it clear that they cannot fill in the large gaps in our child care system by themselves.

The private sector has also taken a larger role in child care. Churches are currently the largest source of child care in America. Funding of child care services has become a priority for the United Way of America. For example, the United Way of Delaware funds more child care services in Delaware than the state government does.

Employers, too, are increasing their investment in child care. The percent of employers providing some type of child care assistance to their employees has increased 400 percent in the

last four years, but still only 3,000 out of six million employers provide some type of child care assistance to their employees. Child care remains the least frequently offered of all employee benefits. Employers' child care assistance can also be quite limited. It ranges from sponsoring noontime seminars on parenting, helping employees find child care, increasing the supply of family day care programs, to sponsoring on-site child care centers. The majority of employers who offer on-site child care are hospitals who use the service as a recruitment tool for nurses. A recent Fortune magazine article highlighted the limitations of on-site child care:

> o The problems with on-site day care are not so obvious. Since the centers have limited openings, some employees get preferential treatment. Manufacturers tend to build on-site day care at headquarters where their higher-paid employees work; often no child care is available at the factories, says, Robert Lurie, President of Resources for Child Care Management, a consulting firm: "You find situations where the people using the centers are the well-paid professionals who can afford the fees."

Few employers actually help employees pay for child care. Those that provide assistance in buying child care generally offer help through a salary reduction, an approach that most benefits higher paid employees. Few employers have followed the example of American Express, which uses its resources to help their own employees as well as families living in the community. American Express sponsors community-wide resource and referral programs and family day care recruitment campaigns.

While the roles of state governments and the private sector have increased, the role of the federal government has diminished. The current administration not only refuses to become an equal partner in the provision of child care, it has abdicated its potential leadership role both in helping to make child care affordable and in ensuring minimal health and safety protections for children in care. Title XX, the largest source of direct federal funds available to help states make child care more affordable to low-income families, has been slashed so dramatically over the past six years that its buying power in 1986 was less than 50 percent of what it was in 1975. We will not have a coherent child care policy in this country until the federal government joins state governments, the private sector, and parents in the emerging partnership.

While the final details of the ABC legislation are still being hammered out through a consensus procedure by Alliance members, as well as child care advocates and policymakers across the country, there are broad principles which underscore this

effort. These include the principle that the federal government has a responsibility to help make child care available and to ensure minimal levels of health and safety protections for children in child care.

In order to meet its child care responsibilities, there is no doubt that the federal government will have to commit substantial new funds. While we understand that there is tremendous resistance to major new federal spending, it is time to face this country's child care needs head on. There is no way that we can help the millions of families who cannot afford child care and improve the quality of that child care without a significant infusion of new resources. We, as a nation, must meet that reality. We realize that we have a formidable task ahead. It will take many voices speaking strongly together to make a national child care policy a reality. We are optmistic because we believe that to put off addressing child care for very much longer threatens not only the future of our young children but of our entire economy.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Ms. Blank. I am with you.

Ms. BLANK. Good.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Because you do have to leave, I am going to ask any of the panel members if they have any questions. If they want to defer at this time, we will allow the record again to remain open so they might write the questions to you and you might communicate back with them through the mail.

Does anyone have any compelling questions they have to ask now?

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Chairman, yes?

Mr. HAWKINS. I have many questions, but I will follow the admonition you have given to us.

I would simply like to take the opportunity to thank Ms. Blank for the cooperation that she has displayed in helping the staff of the committees of the Education and Labor Committee. She has been a tremendous source of expertise and cooperation. And I think we should publicly acknowledge that and express the appreciation of the committee, the full committee as well as the subcommittee, for what she has been doing.

Ms. BLANK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HAWKINS. Thank you.

Ms. BLANK. We look forward to working with you further. We would hope that the ABC bill would come to this committee and we would really have an opportunity to deal with women's and children's issues. Thank you.

Mr. MARTINEZ. I join with the Chairman in showing appreciation for the work you have done not only in helping us, but in helping those children. Thank you.

Ms. BLANK. Thank you.

Mr. MARTINEZ. You are at liberty to go now if you feel so compelled.

Ms. BLANK. Thank you very much.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Engelter.

STATEMENT OF GEORGE ENGELTER, MEMBER, NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF RETIRED PERSONS

Mr. ENGELTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It is a pleasure for me to be here this morning to discuss with you the issues of elder care and family caregivers.

The American Association of Retired Persons, the Nation's largest membership organization of older Americans with more than 26 million members above the age of 50, has a very great interest in this issue from a number of perspectives. Not only are our members receivers of family care, but overwhelmingly they are also the providers of care, especially for the older family members.

Americans are living longer than ever before. The 85 plus population is the Nation's fastest growing age group, and 78 percent of them still live in their own homes or with relatives. Older people turn most frequently to their spouse or adult children when they require help. In 1985 Newsweek magazine estimated that up to 5

million Americans provide care to a parent in some way on any given day.

Contrary to expectations family care for the frail, elderly has become more and more common for a number of reasons. One, of course, is that Medicare compels the release of people from hospitals much earlier than was previously the case.

Another is the lack of consistent insurance mechanisms to pay for long-term elder care. Medicaid is for many people unavailable or an unacceptable choice.

Finally, many care-givers and care receivers simply feel that family care is the best care of all. Care-giving is a burden of love. Care-giving is a family issue, but the care-givers for all family members is usually a woman and she is usually a mid-life or older woman. Of the 2 and two-tenths million Americans providing care for the frail elderly in 1982 more than 70 percent were women. Their average age was 57. And more and more frequently these care-givers also work outside of the home.

It is undisputed that care-giving has many, many rewards. It also extracts many costs, physical, emotional and financial. Indeed, one-third of the elder care-givers rated their own health as only fair or poor. Care-giving is a highly stressful occupation, particularly for those women who also are employed outside of the home. Statistics cannot describe the price paid by those providing care. Nonetheless, I would like to give you a brief view, particularly on the economic issues.

As I noted mid-life and older women work outside the home in very large numbers. More than half of AARP's 7 million working members are women. And 62 percent of women aged 45 to 54 work, a percentage higher than that for working women of all ages, and 42 percent of the women aged 55 to 65 work. Now, these percentages drop significantly for women who care for older parents, whose lower labor force participation is reflected in lower incomes. In 1982 a third of these caregivers were poor or near poor.

Nonetheless, many care-givers do hold jobs outside of the home; 44 percent were care-giving daughters in 1982. But care-giving can be a second full-time job as the recent Traveler's Corporation study found. Often it is entirely too demanding. An astonishingly high 11 percent of mid-life and older working women had to leave their jobs in 1985 to care for an older family member.

Working care-givers struggle to accommodate their two jobs at the least expense to the employer. Unpaid leave is taken only in exceptional circumstances and is of minimum duration. In 1985 fewer than 20 percent of working care-givers for older persons took any unpaid leave whatsoever. Such leave was almost always less than five days' duration.

Time out of the work force for any family member, something women do throughout their work lives, is a major contributor to the gloomy retirement income picture for many older women. Frequent job loss, the lack of job protection for those taking temporary leave and low wages have combined to severely limit the amount of work-related retirement income earned by women.

Public and private pension is a function of time in a job as well as wages. But only 20 percent of women over 65 receive private or public pension as compared to 42 percent for men. Of the very

small number of women, 12 percent, receiving private pensions, the average monthly check for an older woman is half, or $221, of that of an older man of $441.

Social Security income is similarly lower for those who encounter job loss. Longer periods of unemployment and age and sex discrimination when looking for jobs, events that often affect care-givers.

As a general matter, single older women average less than two-thirds the annual retirement income of single older men.

Now, AARP is one of the many groups that has been working diligently on this issue from a variety of perspectives. We have published a host of resource books and pamphlets for care-givers, work with community organizations and employers to develop workshops and related care-giver programs. And we are developing training programs an information on home nursing skills and short-term respite care.

We are encouraged by the business community's increasing recognition that their employees must provide care for their own parents and spouses. We hope that this leads to consistent assistance to the large number of working people who care for their older parents and older family members. Information programs, community care programs, respite care and similar benefits are critical to the helping care-givers cope with their dual careers.

On their own initiative, however, employers have been rather slow to meet one of the critical needs of care-givers, and that is job protection for those who must leave the work force temporarily.

We strongly support the Family and Medical Leave Act now moving through this committee. I urge you not only to support this bill, but to expand it to allow leave for all family members, including spouses, not just parents and children. Only in this way will it reflect the reality of family life today and the multiple roles and responsibilities that women, especially the older woman, in today's work force.

The Family and Medical Leave Act is but one of many reforms needed to recognize the contribution of family care-givers not only to their families but to society in general.

Other reforms, some of which are contained in the Economic Equity Act, such as increased dependent care tax credits, would give economic value to the work of care-givers.

I ask you please to give your strong support on these and related initiatives. And I thank you so very much for this opportunity to speak to you on this critical issue and to give you an overview of the position of my organization. Thank you very much.

[Prepared statement of George Engelter follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF GEORGE ENGELTER, AARP BOARD OF DIRECTORS, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF RETIRED PERSONS

MR. CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE:

THANK YOU FOR THIS OPPORTUNITY TO DISCUSS WITH YOU THE ISSUE OF ELDER CARE AND FAMILY CAREGIVERS. THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF RETIRED PERSONS, THE NATION'S LARGEST MEMBERSHIP ORGANIZATION OF OLDER AMERICANS WITH MORE THAN 26 MILLION MEMBERS ABOVE AGE 50 AND ABOVE, HAS A VERY GREAT INTEREST IN THIS ISSUE FROM A NUMBER OF PERSPECTIVES: NOT ONLY ARE OUR MEMBERS RECEIVERS OF FAMILY CARE, BUT, OVERWHELMINGLY, THEY ARE ALSO THE PROVIDERS OF CARE, ESPECIALLY FOR OLDER FAMILY MEMBERS.

AMERICANS ARE NOW LIVING LONGER THAN EVER BEFORE. THE 85-PLUS POPULATION IS THE NATION'S FASTEST GROWING AGE GROUP, AND 78% OF THEM STILL LIVE IN THEIR OWN HOME OR WITH RELATIVES. OLDER PEOPLE TURN MOST FREQUENTLY TO THEIR SPOUSES OR ADULT CHILDREN WHEN THEY NEED HELP. IN 1985, NEWSWEEK MAGAZINE ESTIMATED THAT UP TO FIVE MILLION AMERICANS PROVIDE CARE TO A

PARENT IN SOME WAY ON ANY GIVEN DAY.

CONTRARY TO EXPECTATIONS, FAMILY CARE FOR THE FRAIL ELDERLY HAS BECOME MORE AND MORE COMMON, FOR A NUMBER OF REASONS. ONE, OF COURSE, IS THAT MEDICARE COMPELS THE RELEASE OF PEOPLE FROM HOSPITALS EARLIER THAN WAS PREVIOUSLY THE CASE. ANOTHER IS THE LACK OF ANY CONSISTENT INSURANCE MECHANISM TO PAY FOR LONG-TERM ELDER CARE. MEDICAID IS, FOR MANY PEOPLE, UNAVAILABLE OR AN UNACCEPTABLE CHOICE. FINALLY, MANY CAREGIVERS AND CARE-RECEIVERS SIMPLY FEEL THAT FAMILY CARE IS THE BEST CARE OF ALL. CAREGIVING IS A BURDEN OF LOVE.

CAREGIVING IS A FAMILY ISSUE, BUT THE CAREGIVER FOR ALL FAMILY MEMBERS IS USUALLY A WOMAN - AND SHE IS USUALLY A MIDLIFE OR OLDER WOMAN. OF THE 2.2 MILLION AMERICANS PROVIDING CARE FOR THE FRAIL ELDERLY IN 1982, MORE THAN 70% WERE WOMEN. THEIR AVERAGE AGE WAS 57. AND, MORE AND MORE FREQUENTLY, THESE CAREGIVERS ALSO WORK OUTSIDE THE HOME.

IT IS UNDISPUTED THAT CAREGIVING HAS MANY, MANY REWARDS. IT ALSO EXTRACTS MANY COSTS - PHYSICAL, EMOTIONAL AND FINANCIAL. INDEED, ONE-THIRD OF ELDER CAREGIVERS RATED THEIR OWN HEALTH AS ONLY FAIR OR POOR. CAREGIVING IS A HIGHLY STRESSFUL OCCUPATION, PARTICULARLY FOR THOSE WOMEN WHO ALSO ARE EMPLOYED OUTSIDE THE HOME. STATISTICS CAN'T REALLY DESCRIBE THE PRICE PAID BY THOSE PROVIDING CARE, BUT NONETHELESS I'D LIKE TO GIVE YOU A FEW,

PARTICULARLY ON THE ECONOMIC ISSUES.

AS I NOTED ABOVE, MIDLIFE AND OLDER WOMEN WORK OUTSIDE THE HOME IN VERY LARGE NUMBERS.

- MORE THAN HALF OF AARP'S SEVEN MILLION WORKING MEMBERS ARE WOMEN.
- 62% OF WOMEN AGED 45-54 WORK - A PERCENTAGE HIGHER THAN THAT FOR WORKING WOMEN OF ALL AGES. 42% OF WOMEN AGED 55 65 WORK.

THESE PERCENTAGES DROP SIGNIFICANTLY FOR WOMEN WHO CARE FOR OLDE PARENTS, WHOSE LOWER LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION IS REFLECTED IN LOWER INCOMES. IN 1982, A THIRD OF THESE CAREGIVERS WERE POOR O NEAR-POOR.

NONETHELESS, MANY CAREGIVERS DO HOLD JOBS OUTSIDE THE HOME - 44% OF CAREGIVING DAUGHTERS IN 1982. BUT CAREGIVING CAN BE A SECOND FULL-TIME JOB, AS THE RECENT TRAVELER'S CORPORATION STUDY FOUND. OFTEN, IT IS TOO DEMANDING - AN ASTONISHINGLY HIGH 11% OF MIDLIFE AND OLDER WORKING WOMEN HAD TO LEAVE THEIR JOBS IN 1985 TO CARE FOR AN OLDER FAMILY MEMBER.

WORKING CAREGIVERS STRUGGLE TO ACCOMMODATE THEIR TWO JOBS AT THE LEAST EXPENSE TO THEIR EMPLOYER. UNPAID LEAVE IS TAKEN ONLY IN EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES AND IS OF MINIMUM DURATION -

- IN 1985, FEWER THAN 20% OF WORKING CAREGIVERS FOR OLDER PERSONS TOOK ANY UNPAID LEAVE WHATSOEVER. SUCH LEAVE WAS ALMOST ALWAYS OF LESS THAN FIVE DAYS DURATION.

TIME OUT OF THE WORKFORCE TO CARE FOR <u>ANY</u> FAMILY MEMBER -

SOMETHING WOMEN DO THROUGHOUT THEIR WORK LIVES - IS A MAJOR CONTRIBUTOR TO THE GLOOMY RETIREMENT INCOME PICTURE FOR MANY OF OLDER WOMEN. FREQUENT JOB LOSS, THE LACK OF JOB PROTECTION FOR THOSE TAKING TEMPORARY LEAVE, AND LOW WAGES HAVE COMBINED TO SEVERELY LIMIT THE AMOUNT OF WORK-RELATED RETIREMENT INCOME EARNED BY WOMEN.

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE PENSION INCOME IS A FUNCTION OF TIME IN A JOB AS WELL AS WAGES. BUT -

- ONLY 20% OF WOMEN OVER 65 RECEIVE PRIVATE OR PUBLIC PENSION BENEFITS, COMPARED TO 42% OF MEN.
- OF THE VERY SMALL NUMBER OF WOMEN (12%) RECEIVING PRIVATE PENSIONS, THE AVERAGE MONTHLY CHECK FOR AN OLDER WOMAN IS HALF ($221) OF THAT FOR AN OLDER MAN ($441).

SOCIAL SECURITY INCOME IS SIMILARLY LOWER FOR THOSE WHO ENCOUNTER JOB LOSS, LONGER PERIODS OF UNEMPLOYMENT AND AGE AND SEX DISCRIMINATION WHEN LOOKING FOR JOBS - EVENTS THAT OFTEN AFFECT CAREGIVERS.

AS A GENERAL MATTER, SINGLE OLDER WOMEN AVERAGE LESS THAN TWO-THIRDS THE ANNUAL RETIREMENT INCOME OF SINGLE OLDER MEN - $6300 COMPARED TO $11,000 IN 1985. I'D LIKE YOU TO NOTE THAT THE POVERTY LINE IN 1985 FOR A SINGLE ADULT WAS ABOUT $5300. THESE FIGURES EXPLAIN WHY 75% OF OLDER PEOPLE LIVING IN POVERTY TODAY ARE WOMEN.

AARP IS ONE OF MANY GROUPS THAT HAS BEEN WORKING ON THIS

ISSUE FROM A VARIETY OF PERSPECTIVES. WE HAVE PUBLISHED A VARIETY OF RESOURCE BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS FOR CAREGIVERS; WORK WITH COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS AND EMPLOYERS TO DEVELOP WORKSHOPS AND RELATED CAREGIVER PROGRAMS; AND ARE DEVELOPING TRAINING PROGRAMS AND INFORMATION ON HOME NURSING SKILLS AND SHORT-TERM RESPITE CARE.

WE ARE ENCOURAGED BY THE BUSINESS COMMUNITY'S INCREASING RECOGNITION THAT THEIR EMPLOYEES MUST PROVIDE CARE FOR THEIR OWN PARENTS AND SPOUSES. WE HOPE THIS LEADS TO SUBSTANTIVE AND CONSISTENT ASSISTANCE TO THE LARGE NUMBER OF WORKING PEOPLE WHO CARE FOR THEIR OLDER PARENTS AND OTHER FAMILY MEMBERS. INFORMATION PROGRAMS, COMMUNITY CARE PROGRAMS, RESPITE CARE AND SIMILAR BENEFITS ARE CRITICAL TO HELPING CAREGIVERS COPE WITH THEIR DUAL CAREERS.

ON THEIR OWN INITIATIVE, HOWEVER, EMPLOYERS HAVE BEEN SLOW TO MEET ONE OF THE MOST CRITICAL NEEDS OF CAREGIVERS - JOB PROTECTION FOR THOSE WHO MUST LEAVE THE WORKFORCE TEMPORARILY. AARP STRONGLY SUPPORTS THE FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE ACT (H.R. 925) NOW MOVING THROUGH THIS COMMITTEE. I URGE YOU NOT ONLY TO SUPPORT THIS BILL BUT TO EXPAND IT TO ALLOW LEAVE FOR ALL FAMILY MEMBERS, INCLUDING SPOUSES, NOT JUST PARENTS AND CHILDREN. ONLY IN THIS WAY WILL IT REFLECT THE REALITY OF FAMILY LIFE TODAY AND THE MULTIPLE ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES WOMEN, ESPECIALLY OLDER WOMEN, IN TODAY'S WORKFORCE.

5

THE FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE ACT IS BUT ONE OF MANY REFORMS NEEDED TO RECOGNIZE THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF FAMILY CAREGIVERS NOT ONLY TO THEIR FAMILIES BUT TO SOCIETY IN GENERAL. OTHER REFORMS, SOME OF WHICH ARE CONTAINED IN THE ECONOMIC EQUITY ACT, SUCH AS INCREASED DEPENDANT CARE TAX CREDITS, WOULD GIVE ECONOMIC VALUE TO THE WORK OF CAREGIVERS. I ENCOURAGE YOU TO WORK ON THESE AND RELATED INITIATIVES AND THANK YOU FOR THIS OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK WITH YOU ON THIS CRITICAL ISSUE.

79-107 0 - 87 - 9

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you very much, George. You see how I got around that name?

This is an appropriate time for the Chair to announce that there will be a 10 minute recess for the members to go to the floor and vote. And we will return. Please bear with us.

[Recess.]

Mr. MARTINEZ. We are going to reconvene, and any of the members that join us can pick up where we are when they come in.

Next, we will go to Ms. Pearce. Would you like to begin?

STATEMENT OF DIANA PEARCE, DIRECTOR, WOMEN AND POVERTY PROJECT

Ms. PEARCE. I would like to thank the Chair and members of the Economic Opportunities Subcommittee for this opportunity to address you concerning problems faced by employed women, especially low income women.

One of the dilemmas faced by many employed women is making the choice between working full-time and part-time. While there is much rhetoric about how the job market has restructured itself to meet the needs for flexibility of working women, particularly women who are mothers of small children, every woman knows that choosing the flexible, part-time option means taking a job that is not considered a real job by her employers or even by herself. Only full-time workers are considered real workers in this economy. And only full-time jobs are considered real jobs.

I would like today to talk to you about this problem of the many women who are marginal workers, part-time or temporary, first by describing part-time work and some of its character, then discussing two key issues in this area.

First, the assertion that many women, especially mothers who want part-time work and are voluntary part-time workers, therefore, it is not a problem. And secondly, the issue where their fringe benefits are really important since many people have access to other sources of fringe benefits. And then I will end with some ideas about how to deal with some of the issues.

Part-time/temporary work is a fast growing, but invisible ghetto experienced by more and more women workers. Many of these workers, because they work out of site as night-time office cleaners, urban transit drivers, cafeteria cooks, and hospital laundry workers, are doubly invisible. But even those who are seen by the public inhabit an invisible occupational ghetto. We are all familiar with the pink collar ghetto and the secretarial pool which are visible examples of the confinement of women workers to jobs with relatively little economic opportunity. But when we enter a retail store, eat at a restaurant or do business over the telephone, there is no way of knowing who is full-time and who is part-time. Yet, the invisible ghetto of part-time is equally as restricting on the economic opportunity of its inhabitants as the traditional occupational ghettoes that we have become acquainted with through the struggle over pay equity.

Part-time work is a working women's issue because two-thirds of part-time workers are women. Twice the proportion of employed women as compared to men, over a quarter compared to 12 percent

of men, work at part-time schedules. Moreover, these proportions are likely to increase. Other groups which have traditionally worked disproportionately on part-time schedules, namely teenagers and older, near-retirement men, are decreasing in numbers in the labor force while women are projected to be two-thirds of all new workers by 1995.

When combined with temporary or seasonal work, we find that only 48 percent of employed women work full-time, year-round; that is, at least 50 to 52 weeks per year. Thus, the problems associated with the marginal status of the part-time/temporary worker are of direct concern to the majority of women workers.

I would like to add, by the way, that almost all the figures that we use on pay differential, like the 59 cents or 64 cents on the dollar, the occupational segregation of women workers, are all calculated on full-time, year-round workers, which is two-thirds of men but only 48 percent of women. And it is very misleading and excludes from our purview the situation of the majority of women workers.

Part-time jobs are often temporary and/or seasonal as well. Only about a third of women part-time workers worked all year. And 40 percent work less than half the year. So, when I say part-time, in a sense it is a shorthand for the marginal woman worker. It is also temporary.

Part-time jobs are poorly paid. Part-time jobs tend to be lower waged while 5 percent of all jobs pay the minimum wage or less, over a quarter of part-time jobs are minimum wage jobs.

Part-time jobs rarely have fringe benefits. About 84 percent of part-time jobs provide no health coverage because of their low pay, shorter hours and their temporary nature, leave the worker unqualified for unemployment insurance. Few provide sick leave, paid holidays, pension or retirement funds, et cetera.

Part-time jobs are rarely an avenue to full-time work. Employers do not value work experience gained as a part-time worker. And even when part-time employees seek to move into full-time status in the same job, they are often treated as outside applicants and time put in as a part-time employee is not counted toward seniority.

Moreover, opportunities to move into full-time employment are decreasing as employers simply eliminate all full-time positions or forbid, as with temporary office workers, the worker or the employer from converting a person from part-time/temporary to full-time/permanent status.

Part-time jobs are concentrated at the lower end of the occupational hierarchy. And this is I think somewhat different than our impression from reading what I call the Sunday supplement sociology. Women professionals, such as doctors and lawyers overwhelmingly work full-time. In contrast, three-fourths of part-time jobs held by women are found in the service, sales and clerical sectors. Over half of service and sales jobs held by women are part-time. Even among clerical jobs, one-fourth of those held by women are part-time.

Part-time jobs are impoverishing. Of women heads of households who do not work at all, 57 percent are poor. Working part-time only reduces this poverty rate to 47 percent. But full-time work for

women reduces this poverty rate to 15 percent. So, there is a huge difference between full and part-time work. So, going to work is not the solution in this society because of all the wage rates and other problems.

Part-time jobs are expanding. Since 1968 part-time jobs have grown faster than full-time. In part this is a chicken and egg phenomenon. The fastest growing sectors, services, transportation, information, et cetera, are precisely the sectors which are heavily part-time in their job structure. Thus the third fastest growing industry is that of temporary help.

But it is more than just a consequence of the expansion of the service sector. Many primary sector employers are converting full-time jobs to part-time. For example, Best Products order takers were 60 percent part-time in 1983, but 75 part-time by last year. Even the Federal Government has expanded its part-time/temporary work force. There are now over 300,000 Federal workers who can work up to four years without benefits, sick leave or any accruing of seniority.

The percentage of workers on part-time schedules has expanded relatively slowly, from 15 percent in 1954 to about 20 to 22 percent today. But several indicators suggest this will accelerate in the future.

First of all, part-time employment generally expands during recessions and contracts with recovery. The mid-1980s showed no such pattern. In other words, it did not decrease again after the recession. Thus, in 1985 of 3 million new jobs, one-third were part-time, and most of those were taken by women.

Second, the expansion of the service sector which has accounted for much of the expansion of part-time employment in the past is projected to continue to expand in numbers and in terms of its proportion of employment.

But is it a problem? I want to talk about two issues that people usually bring up when they are talking about part-time employment.

First, one frequently hears that the preponderance of women among part-time workers and part-time schedules among employed women is not a problem because most part-time workers are voluntary—women workers are voluntary.

There are three major problems with this assertion. First, the term voluntary no longer adequately describes the kind of choices made. The way the data is collected, voluntary includes not only those who actively choose between part-time and full-time, but also those who "choose" part-time jobs when there is no full-time option; that is, because they knowingly chose a part-time job, that choice is considered voluntary. Put another way, the only time part-time employment is considered involuntary is when the employee has his hours reduced involuntarily by the employer.

Because of the expansion of part-time employment, for many workers, especially new and reentering workers, the choice is not between full and part-time, but between part-time and no time—that is, no job. In this situation, it is misleading to label such a choice as voluntary, but we continue to do so.

Further evidence of the problematic meaning of voluntary is found in increasing numbers of women who are moonlighting, who

are holding more than one job. It now includes almost 2 million women.

The second problem with the assertion that part-time work among women is not an issue because it is largely voluntary, is that this ignores the context in which such choices are made. The assumption often stated explicitly is that employed because voluntarily choose part-time because it meets their need for flexibility to fulfill their domestic obligations, particulary care of dependents. Such an understanding ignores the fact there is a critical shortage of child care that severely constrains such free choice. Thus, 35 percent of women working part-time would work more hours if adequate child care were available. Is it a voluntary choice when a woman chooses part-time work with adequate or no need for dependent care over full-time work with inadequate or no dependent care?

And I think the remarks of Helen Blank are quite appropriate here. There is a tremendous need for child care that constrains women's choices in the labor market.

As it now stands, the advantages of part-time employment's flexibility accrue to the employer in lower wage costs while the costs accrue to the women worker in limited opportunities for better wages, advancement, training, et cetera.

This does not mean that no women worker is really voluntarily choosing part-time over full-time work, but rather that until there is adequate child and dependent care available so that choices are truly voluntary, we will not really know what the real level of voluntary, part-time employment is. Until the voluntary/involuntary distinction among part-time workers must be rejected not only as false, but misleading in our attempts to understand the problems of working women.

Third and finally, even if one does accept the voluntary/involuntary distinction, it is clear that more and more part-time workers are defining themselves as involuntary.

And voluntary part-time employment grew only 6.5 percent, while involuntary part-time employment grew 60 percent over the last six years. Secondly, the fringes issues. Few would disagree that part-time employees generally have few, if any, of the fringe benefits. But is often asserted that it is not a serious problem for it is maintained that many part-time workers have access to health insurance through spouses or other relatives.

First, there are substantial numbers of part-time workers who do not have access to benefits through others. Thus, while 42 percent do have health coverage through a spouse or other relative, 42 percent of part-time workers have no access to health coverage.

Second, many so-called fringe benefits cannot be gotten secondhand. Thus, the lack of sick leave and paid holidays, the non-qualification for unemployment insurance, the non-vesting in a pension, are all fringe benefits whose lack has direct and non-replaceable economic costs for the non-covered part-time worker.

It should be noted that these economic costs should be reckoned not in dollars and cents, but rather in economic security. Part-time workers and their families experience real economic insecurity as a consequence of the lack of fringe benefits.

Ultimately, the lack of fringe benefits and the resulting economic insecurity becomes a societal problem. When part-time workers play the health roulette because they lack health insurance and lose, society must pick up the tab in the form of charity health care or Medicaid. When the need for sick leave or child care or health care forces a part-time worker who is also a parent to leave employment and seek welfare and Medicaid, society must pay. When a part-time worker who has accrued little seniority, no training and low wages reaches middle age and becomes a displaced homemaker, society must pay. When a part-time worker becomes disabled or reaches retirement age with little or no pension or insurance and inadequate Social Security, society must pay.

Towards some solutions. As suggested by the discussion of fringe benefits above, the problem of part-time employment is more than one of lower wages. Rather, the invisible ghetto of part-time/temporary work, overwhelmingly women and disproportionately minority, is creating an underclass of workers and their families who suffer from low income and severe economic insecurity.

The inequality in both resources and security, between the inhabitants of this invisible ghetto and full-time workers, shows every indication of increasing unless something is done.

Three areas where the problems of part-time employment could be addressed by public policy are—the first area to be addressed is the unequal wages of full and part-time workers. Full and part-time workers should be paid equal wages for equal work, including pro-rated fringe benefits, seniority credits, access to training, et cetera. Part-time work should simply refer to hours, not to a whole set of wage rates, benefits and economic opportunities that contributed to the widening inequality between full-time and part-time workers.

The second area is more difficult but crucial. And that is we must find the means for employers to share the costs of fringe benefits, such as health insurance, among all employed members of a family. This should include as well non-custodial parents. We have made important strides towards sharing cash resources after divorce through child support enforcement. We must now begin to think about the economic security resources which may not be equally distributed between the mother and father, but which are crucial to the children's future health, education, et cetera.

The third area involves developing societal measures to more adequately equalize access of all employed persons to economic security resources. This strategy would be analogous to auto insurance. States have decided it is not in society's interest to have some individuals drive around without insurance for the cost is borne both unfairly by random victims and societally in terms of charity health care. Some workers have employers who do not provide any employees fringe benefits so that the first measure, the prorated benefits, would not reach them. And some also have no access through a spouse or ex-spouse to such resources. Measures in this area to cover these people might include employer or employee buy-in to Medicaid or subsidized HMO memberships, portable or partial pensions, earnings sharing Social Security, broadened eligibility for unemployment insurance, et cetera.

Thank you.

[Prepared statement of Diana M. Pearce follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DIANA M. PEARCE, DIRECTOR, WOMEN AND POVERTY PROJECT

I would like to thank the Chair and Members of the Economic Opportunities Subcommittee for this opportunity to address you concerning problems faced by employed women, especially low-income women. Part-time/temporary work is a fast-growing, but invisible ghetto experienced by more and more women workers. Many of these workers, because they work 'out of sight' as nighttime office cleaners, urban transit drivers, cafeteria cooks and hospital laundry workers, are doubly invisible. But even those who are 'seen' by the public inhabit an invisible occupational ghetto. We are all familiar with the pink collar ghetto, and the secretarial pool, which are visible examples of the confinement of women workers to jobs with relatively little economic opportunity. But when we enter a retail store, eat at a restaurant, or do business over the telephone, there is no way of knowing who is full-time and who is part-time, yet the invisible ghetto of part-time is equally as restricting on the economic opportunity of its inhabitants as the traditional occupational ghettoes.

Part-time work is a working women's issue because two-thirds of part-time workers are women. Twice the proportion of employed women as compared to men - over a quarter compared to 12% - work at part-time schedules. Moreover, these proportions are likely to increase: other groups which have traditionally worked disproportionately on part-time schedules,

THE FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE ACT IS BUT ONE OF MANY REFORMS NEEDED TO RECOGNIZE THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF FAMILY CAREGIVERS NOT ONLY TO THEIR FAMILIES BUT TO SOCIETY IN GENERAL. OTHER REFORMS, SOME OF WHICH ARE CONTAINED IN THE ECONOMIC EQUITY ACT, SUCH AS INCREASED DEPENDANT CARE TAX CREDITS, WOULD GIVE ECONOMIC VALUE TO THE WORK OF CAREGIVERS. I ENCOURAGE YOU TO WORK ON THESE AND RELATED INITIATIVES AND THANK YOU FOR THIS OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK WITH YOU ON THIS CRITICAL ISSUE.

namely teenagers and older, near-retirement, men, are decreasing in numbers in the labor force, while women are projected to be two-thirds of all new workers by 1995. When combined with temporary/seasonal/ work, we find that only 48% of employed women work full-time, year-round(i.e., at least 50-52 weeks per year.) Thus the problems associated with the marginal status of the part-time/temporary worker are of direct concern to the majority of women workers.

I. Part-time jobs: what they are and are not

Part-time jobs are often temporary and/or seasonal as well. Only about one-third of women part-time workers worked all year, and 40% worked less than half the year.

Part-time jobs are poorly paid. Whether it is defined as 20, 30, or 35 hours per week, part-time workers are frequently paid less than those doing the same work who have full-time schedules, with estimates ranging from 38% to 75% of equivalent full-time workers' wages. Moreover, part-time jobs tend to be lower waged: while 5% of all jobs pay the minimum wage or less, over one-fourth of part-time jobs are minimum wage or less.

Part-time jobs rarely have fringe benefits. About 84% of part-time jobs provide no health coverage. Many - because of their low pay, shorter hours and/or temporary nature - leave the worker unqualified for unemployment insurance. Few provide sick leave, paid holidays, pension or retirement funds, etc.

Part-time jobs are rarely an avenue to full-time work. Employers do not value work experience gained as a part-time worker, and even when part-time employees seek to move into full-time status in the same job, they are often treated as 'outside' applicants, and time put in as a part-time employee is not counted towards seniority. Moreover, opportunities to move into full-time employment are decreasing, as employers simply eliminate all full-time positions, or forbid - as with temporary office workers - the worker (or the employer) from converting a person from part-time/temporary to full-time/permanent.

Part-time jobs are concentrated at the lower end of the occupational hierarchy. Women professionals, such as doctors and lawyers, overwhelmingly work full-time. In contrast, three-fourths of the part-time jobs held by women are found in the service, sales and clerical sectors. Over half of the service and sales jobs held by women are part-time; even among clerical jobs, one-fourth of those held by women are part-time.

Part-time jobs are impoverishing. Of women heads of household who do not work at all, 57% are poor. Working part-time only reduces this poverty rate to 47%, but full-time work for women maintaining households alone reduces the poverty rate for this group to only 15%.

Part-time jobs are expanding. Since 1968, part-time jobs have grown faster than full-time. In part, this is a chicken and egg phenomenon; the fastest growing sectors - services,

transportation, information, etc., are precisely the sectors which are heavily part-time in their job structure. Thus the third fastest growing industry is that of "temporary help." But it is more than just the consequence of the expansion of the service sector: many primary sector employers are converting full-time jobs to part-time: for example, Best Products' order takers were 60% part-time in 1983, but 75% part-time by last year. Even the federal government has expanded its part-time/temporary workforce: there are now over 300,000 federal workers who can work up to four years without benefits, sick leave, or any accruing of seniority.

The percentage of workers on part-time schedules has expanded relatively slowly, from 15% in 1954 to about 20 to 22% today. But several indicators suggest that this will accelerate in the future. First, while part-time employment generally expands during recessions, and contracts with recovery, the mid-eighties show no such pattern. Thus, in 1985, of three million new jobs, one-third were part-time. Second, the expansion of the service sector, which has accounted for much of the expansion of part-time employment in the past, is projected to continue to expand in numbers, and in terms of its proportion of employment.

II. But is it a Problem? The "voluntary" issue and the "fringes" issue

1. The "voluntary" issue

One frequently hears that the preponderance of women among part-time workers, and part-time schedules among employed women, is not a problem because most part-time women workers are voluntary. There are three major problems with this assertion.

First, the term 'voluntary' no longer adequately describes the kind of choice made. The way the data is collected, voluntary includes not only those who actively choose between part-time and full-time, but also those who 'choose' part-time jobs when there is no full-time option; that is, because they knowingly chose a part-time job, that choice is considered 'voluntary.' Put another way, the only time part-time employment is considered involuntary is when the employee is involuntarily reduced involuntarily by the employer.

Because of the expansion of part-time employment, for many workers, especially new and reentering workers, the choice is not between full and part-time, but between part-time and no-time, i.e., no job. In this situation, it is misleading to label such choices voluntary.

Further evidence of the problematic meaning of voluntary is found in the increasing numbers of women who are "moonlighting,"

i.e., who are holding more than one job. In just one decade, from 1970 to 1980, the proportion of "moonlighters" doubled from 16% to 33%, and now encompasses 1.9 million women.

The second problem with the assertion that part-time work among women is not an issue because it is largely voluntary, is that this ignores the context in which such choices are made. The assumption, often stated explicitly, is that employed women voluntarily choose part-time work because it meets their "need" for flexibility to fulfill their domestic obligations, particularly the care of dependents. Such an understanding ignores the fact that there is a critical shortage of child care that severely constrains free choice: thus 35% of women working part-time would work more hours, if adequate child care were available. Is it a 'voluntary' choice when a woman chooses part-time work with adequate (or no need for) dependent care over full-time work with inadequate or no dependent care?

As it now stands, the advantages of part-time employment's 'flexibility' accrue to the employer (i.e., in lower wage costs), while the costs accrue to the women worker (i.e., in limited opportunities for better wages, advancement, etc.) This does not mean that no women worker is really voluntarily choosing part-time over full-time work, but rather that until there is adequate child and dependent care available, so that choices are truly voluntary, we will not really know what the real level of voluntary part-time employment is. Until then, the

voluntary/involuntary distinction among part-time workers must be rejected as not only false, but misleading in our attempts to understand the problems of working women.

Third and finally, even if one is to accept the voluntary/involuntary distinction, it is clear that more and more part-time workers are defining themselves as involuntary. Between 1979 and 1985, voluntary part-time employment grew 6.5%, while involuntary part-time employment grew 60%.

2. The Fringes Issue

Few would disagree that part-time employees generally have few, if any, of the fringe benefits associated with full-time employment. But it is often asserted that this is not a serious problem, for it is maintained that many part-time workers have access to health insurance, for example through their spouses, parents, etc.

First, there are substantial numbers of part-time workers who do not have access to benefits through others. Thus while 42% do have health coverage through a spouse or other relative, 42% of part-time workers have no access to health coverage.

Second, many so-called fringe benefits cannot be gotten secondhand. Thus, the lack of sick leave and paid holidays, the non-qualification for unemployment insurance, the non-vesting in a pension, are all fringe benefits whose lack has direct, and non-replaceable economic costs for the non-covered part-time worker. It should be noted that these "economic costs" should

be reckoned, not in dollars and cents, but rather in economic security. Part-time workers, and their families, experience real economic insecurity as a consequence of the lack of fringe benefits.

Ultimately, the lack of fringe benefits, and the resulting economic insecurity, becomes a societal problem. When part-time workers play the health roulette because they lack health insurance, and lose, society must pick up the tab in the form of charity health care or Medicaid. When the need for sick leave or child care or health care forces a part-time worker who is also a parent, to leave employment and seek welfare and Medicaid, society must pay. When a part-time worker, who has accrued little seniority, no training, and low wages, reaches middle age and becomes a displaced homemaker, society must pay. When a part-time worker becomes disabled, or reaches retirement age, with little or no pension or insurance and inadequate Social Security, society must pay.

III. Towards Some Solutions

As suggested by the discussion of fringe benefits above, the problem of part-time employment is more than one of lower wages. Rather, the invisible ghetto of part-time/temporary work, overwhelmingly women and disproportionately minority, is creating an underclass of workers and their families who suffer from low income and severe economic insecurity. The inequality,

in both resources and security, between the inhabitants of the invisible ghetto and full-time workers, shows every indication of increasing, unless something is done. Three areas where the problems of part-time employment could be addressed by public policy are as follows.

Clearly, the first area to be addressed is the unequal wages of full and part-time workers: full and part-time workers should be paid equal wages for equal work, including pro-rated fringe benefits, seniority credits, access to training, etc. Part-time work should simply refer to hours, not to a whole set of wage rates, benefits, and economic opportunities that contribute to widening inequality between full-time and part-time workers.

The second area is more difficult, but crucial, and that is that we must find the means for employers to share the costs of fringe benefits, such as health insurance, among all employed members of a family. This should include, as well, non-custodial parents; we have made important strides toward sharing cash resources after divorce through child support enforcement, we must begin to think about the economic security resources which may not be equally distributed between the mother and father, but which are crucial to the children's future health, education, etc.

The third area involves developing societal measures to more adequately equalize access of all employed persons to

economic security resources. The strategy would be analogous to auto insurance: states have decided it is not in society's interest to have some individuals drive without insurance, for the cost is borne both unfairly by random victims, and societally in terms of charity care. Some workers have employers who do not provide any employees fringe benefits, so that the first measure would not reach them, and some also have no access through a spouse or ex-spouse to such resources. Measures in this area might include employer or employee buy-in to Medicaid, or subsidized HMO memberships, portable or partial pensions, earnings sharing in Social Security, broadened eligibility for unemployment insurance, etc.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Ms. Pearce.
Ms. Moss.

STATEMENT OF ANNE MOSS, DIRECTOR, WOMEN'S PENSION PROJECT, PENSION RIGHTS CENTER

Ms. Moss. My name is Anne Moss. I am the Director of the Women's Pension Project of the Pension Rights Center. The Center is a nonprofit group that works for more equitable pension programs.

I want to thank the Chairman and the members of the subcommittee for having this hearing on the Economic Equity Act which has so many important economic reforms for women.

I plan to talk briefly about just the private pension reform provisions.

We think that an employer sponsored pension is essential when a working women retires because typically that is about all she will have to live on besides her Social Security. For women retiring today, the average Social Security benefit is around $5,000 a year. And few retirees have much in the way of retirement savings. But the problem is that only about 11 percent of women 65 and over collect private pensions which average about $2600 a year.

The main reasons that women have done so poorly under private pension plans are that they have been often been excluded from pension plans; that plans have had unreasonable vesting requirements, frequently 10 years that women workers cannot meet; pension formulas are designed to skew benefits in favor of highly paid or long service workers who are typically not women.

Congress though has recognized how essential pensions are for a decent retirement, and they have decided that our tax subsidized pension plans must be fair to low and moderate income workers. Tax breaks that employers receive for maintaining employee pension plans will cost the Treasury about $37 billion in lost revenue this year.

Congress has passed some very far-reaching pension reform legislation in the past few years, including provisions of such laws as the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982, the Retirement Equity Act, and last year's Tax Reform Act. Altogether these and other pension reforms represent a dramatic change in pension law that should mean more pensions for millions of working women in years to come. But there are still women who will lose out. This year's Economic Equity Act will close more of those pension loopholes.

In the pension coverage area, many working women are not members of plans even though their employers have plans. That is because employers are still allowed to exclude employees by job category, for example, such as excluding all secretaries or all hourly workers.

We have heard that some employers in the retail and service industries—and especially in the fast food industry—who are deliberately scheduling employees to work less than 1,000 hours a year, which means that it is much easier to exclude them from the plan.

The Economic Equity Act comes close to requiring almost 100 percent pension coverage where an employer already maintains a

plan. It would require plans to include virtually every employee who is at least aged 21 and who is within what it called a single line of business. It will also require plans to include many more part-time workers.

The Economic Equity Act would also improve vesting requirements. Last year's Tax Reform Act will require plans to let workers become vested after 5 years of service rather than 10, which is much more reasonable. That starts going into effect in 1989. But the new 5 year vesting requirement does not apply to union negotiated plans to which more than one employer contributes, known as multi-employer plans, for example, construction trades' union plans.

If women are able to get nontraditional jobs, then we think they ought to have a reasonable chance of collecting a pension. The Economic Equity Act extends 5 year vesting to all private plans.

The Economic Equity Act also addresses the problem of pension integration with Social Security. Integration means that a plan can count a portion of a worker's Social Security against her pension. This is a very widespread practice that tends to diminish or wipe out completely the pensions of lower paid workers and, therefore, hits women workers the hardest.

We recently heard from a women who worked part-time for 10 years and was lucky enough to be covered under her plan, and she did become vested. But now she has been told that when she gets to be 65 in about five or six years, she can expect a pension of 47 cents a month. And this is because her plan is integrated. We found it hard to believe that the pension would actually send her a letter saying you'll get a pension of 47 cents a month, but it was obviously a form letter.

Even if she had worked—we think under the same plan if she had been able to work a full career of 35 or 40 years, then she would have gotten not much more than that amount.

Last year's Tax Reform Act says that starting with the pension that a worker accumulates in 1989 and after, a worker cannot lose her entire pension to integration, but only half the pension. This was a very important reform, but now I am starting to get letters from workers that say half my pension? Why shouldn't I be able to collect all of my pension? I earned it after all.

The Economic Equity Act would gradually eliminate the practice of pension integration with Social Security.

The bill would also require—at least it would require government studies of the feasibility of requiring plans to provide pension portability which we think would help a lot of women.

It also would require plans to—a study of requiring plans to provide cost-of-living increases for retirees.

Both of these we think would help women.

We are looking forward to the day when we have a pension system that gives women adequate benefits reflecting all their time in the work force. And we hope Congress will act quickly to remove the remaining inequities.

Thank you for giving us a chance to present our views.

[Prepared statement of Anne Moss follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF ANNE MOSS, DIRECTOR, WOMEN'S PENSION PROJECT, PENSION RIGHTS CENTER

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Subcommittee, I am Anne Moss, Director of the Women's Pension Project of the Pension Rights Center. The Center is a nonprofit organization that has been working for the past decade to make the nation's pension programs fairer and more responsive to the needs of workers and retirees.

I want to thank the Subcommittee for holding a hearing focusing on H.R. 2577, the Economic Equity Act, which would provide many very significant economic reforms for women. I will discuss only the private pension reform provisions today. These provisions are also included in H.R.2613, The Pension Reform Act of 1987, introduced by Rep. Barbara Kennelly and H.R.2575, The Nonfull-time Employee Benefits Protection Act of 1987, introduced by Rep. Patricia Schroeder.

Why women need pensions. A woman retiring today will need much more than her social security benefit, which now averages less than $5000 a year. Few retirees have significant savings to bolster that amount. According to a recent study of social security recipients, half of all married individuals have accumulated less than $8000 total in financial assets (other than a home); half of all married couples have less than $16,000. A worker must have something more to supplement her income - this is the role that should be played by an employer-sponsored pension.

Why women don't receive adequate pensions. The problem is that only 11% of women 65 and over collect private

pensions, compared to 29% of men. And when they do get pensions, the benefits average only $2667 a year - men receive $4902. There are many reasons why so few women collect decent pensions, but three important ones are: (1) Women are less likely to be members of pension plans, (2) plans frequently have unreasonable length-of-service requirements for pension eligibility that women workers cannot meet, and 3) pension formulas tend to skew benefits in favor of highly-paid or long-service workers who are typically not women.

Recent pension reforms. Fortunately, Congress has recognized that pensions are absolutely essential to a decent retirement, and that tax-subsidized pension plans must be fair to low and moderate-income workers. (Employers receive annual tax deductions for making contributions to pension plans, and are not taxed on the earnings of pension fund investments. These tax breaks will cost the Treasury over $37 billion in lost revenue this year.) Although pensions were once regarded as a way to reward certain favored employees, the modern view is that they are deferred wages: a worker accepts lower wages while working in exchange for getting a pension at retirement.

Private pension plans are governed by provisions of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA) and the Internal Revenue Code. In the last five years, we have seen much pension reform on behalf of women workers through the enactment of laws that strengthen ERISA and the tax code.

- The Tax Equity & Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982 - Provisions of TEFRA require three-year vesting and a minimum benefit for employees under plans that pay more than 60% of benefits to the company owners and other key employees. TEFRA primarily helps women working in support-staff jobs in small professional offices.

- The Retirement Equity Act of 1984 - The REA requires plans to include workers starting at age 21 rather than age 25, and give credit toward vesting starting at age 18 rather than 22. It also makes it easier for a woman who takes time off from a job, for family responsibilities or other reasons, to preserve the credits she has already earned.

- The Tax Reform Act of 1986 - Provisions of this law require plans to include more workers and let most workers vest in 5 rather than 10 years. It also prohibits plans from entirely eliminating a worker's pension benefit by "integrating" it with social security. These provisions start going into effect in 1989.

- The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1986 - OBRA prohibits plans from excluding workers who start a job after age 60 and requires plans to continue giving pension credits to individuals working past age 65. These provisions go into effect in 1988.

The pension reforms of the REA, the Tax Reform Act, and OBRA all originated in provisions of the Economic Equity Act of past years. Collectively, these reforms represent dramatic change in pension law that should result in more and better pensions for millions of working women for years to come. But even these protections leave gaps in the law, through which many women will still lose out.

THE ECONOMIC EQUITY ACT OF 1987

This year's Economic Equity Act would close more legal loopholes by addressing the following problems:

Coverage. Many women who work for employers who sponsor pension plans are not included in those plans. But even the improvements of the Tax Reform Act will not help everyone. Employers will still be able to exclude employees by category, such as "all secretaries" or "all casual workers," as long as they include enough other workers of different salary levels. We have also heard that some employers in the retail and service industries are deliberately scheduling their employees to work just under 1000 hours a year, since all workers with less than 1000 hours can be immediately excluded.

The Economic Equity Act would require plans to include virtually every employee who is at least age 21 and within a "single line of business." It will also require plans to include part-time workers who customarily work at least 500 hours a year.

Eligibility for benefits. The Tax Reform Act made a tremendous improvement when it required plans to start letting workers vest after five years service, rather than ten. However, five year-vesting does not apply to union-negotiated plans to which more than one employer contributes, known as multi-employer plans. Although women are gradually obtaining non-traditional jobs, such as in the construction trades, they will not be likely to collect pensions if they

have to work 10 years. The EEA would extend five-year vesting to all private plans.

Pension integration. For years, pension plans have been permitted to take into account a worker's social security benefits when figuring her pension benefit. This is known as pension "integration" with social security. One type of pension integration allows employers to subtract part of an employee's social security from her pension. However, because social security benefits replace a greater proportion of earnings for a lower income worker, taking into account a low income worker's social security could reduce or completely wipe out a worker's pension. Integration has always hit women workers harder than men, because women tend to dominate the lower-paid positions in the work force. Yet these are workers who need pensions most.

The Tax Reform Act says that a worker must still be left with half her pension after integration is applied. However, many workers question why they shouldn't be able to receive the entire pension. The EEA would eventually eliminate the practice of integration.

* * *

The Economic Equity Act also addresses other pension issues crucial to working women:

Pension portability. The typical worker changes jobs many times during a career. Assuming that she becomes vested, she will still end up with a pension based on wages fixed as of the date she leaves the plan. According to one

study, a worker who has four jobs, for ten years each, would get about half the pension of the worker who works continuously for forty years on one job.

Congress should consider the feasibility of providing true pension portability by requiring that plans allowing a worker with a vested right to a pension at a later retirement age, be allowed to request, when leaving the company, that the plan transfer the value of the pension benefits to a "Portable Pension Plan" or at least index the worker's deferred vested pension until retirement age. The British pension system already uses a type of indexing.

The EEA requires a government study of the feasibility of pension portability.

Cost of living. Inflation has an especially devastating impact on retirees. A retiree entitled to a pension is likely to receive the same amount for the rest of her life. We hear from retirees who tell us they are still getting $65 or $75 a month, the same pension they were getting a decade ago. The problem of mandating cost-of-living increases is a complex one. However, it is definitely practicable where a plan is well-funded or overfunded. Congress should explore the possibility of requiring cost of living increases in these situations. The EEA requires a government study of ways of establishing a national system of pension portability.

We are looking forward to making greater strides, with the Subcommittee's help, toward an equitable system that

accurately reflects the time women spend in the work force. We hope that Congress will act swiftly to remove the remaining inequities that prevent our retired workers from receiving the adequate retirement income they need to enjoy their later years in dignity.

Thank you for the opportunity to present our views.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you very much, Ms. Moss.

Several things come to mind, and more importantly than any is the fact that there needs to be as much emphasis placed on pension reform as any other aspect of problems concerning women.

One of the things that Ms. Pearce brought up that is of great concern to many of us as we consider these problems and situations is part-time element. You know, clearly the Department of Labor and many people who handle this problem do not consider part-time work as much different from that defined in your testimony. Somehow or another they have been lulled into some mistaken impression that because of the benefits to the employer, more than to the employee, part-time work does not create any detrimental effects on those part-time workers themselves, basically because of the misconception that most part-time workers choose to work part-time.

Let me tell you something. I know an employer in my district who wore his liberalism on his chest like a badge. And yet, how liberal thinking was he when he did not have one single employee in his business that was full-time? He required them to work that minimum time to keep them from being full-time employees, and for what reason? No other reason than that he would not have to provide the benefits that you normally have to provide by law to a full-time worker.

Now, because of that experience, as I have been involved in both the state level government and here in Washington, it never has fooled me one bit why so many people hire part-time workers when, in fact, they could use a lesser number of employees if they could hire full-time workers.

The other thing that has always been a hypocrisy to me is the unemployment rate. Consider that women are 44 percent of the work force and 52 percent of these are women that are working part-time even considering that there are some women who want part-time work because of family obligations.

We mistakenly say family obligations are more important to them, a priority to them. But that family obligation sometimes is because they have no choice because they have no way of providing day care for them. We then skew our perception of this, and we are not thinking of it in true perspective.

And it has been a big hypocrisy to me that of that part-time work force, which is probably about one-quarter of the unemployment rate that we deem is current, which would then put that at about 1.2 percent higher than it actually is which helps whoever is trying to make that statistic a valued one to them that we have reduced unemployment to this percentage rate.

I do not know how it got to be that we changed our interpretation of what was full employment. At one time in this country you normally have about a 2 to 3 percent changeover from job to job, always moving from place to place so that you really consider full employment if it really is a valid thing at about 2 or 3 percent of the unemployment rate. When we have an unemployment rate of 2 or 3 percent, then we consider it full employment.

I do not really buy that either because I think those figures can be skewed.

But all of a sudden that 6.1 or 6.2, or whatever it is now, becomes an acceptable rate from the same people who told us that it was deplorable to have that rate when initially we are running for office.

Now, it even gets worse if you then now include the military, which has never been included there, and include these part-time workers which should not be included in there because they really want full-time work. And if you really look in true numbers the statistics themselves are not factual, I will give you the best example I can.

When I visited the Virgin Islands, which has 110,000 population, that little group that is part of U.S. property says that they can accurately, because of the small numbers—their Department of Labor told me they can accurately determine how many people are eligible and willing to work and how many people are actually employed. And when they measure by their actual count the unemployment rate, it gets to be about 3 or 4 percent higher than what their Department of Labor figures. So, if you took that and extrapolated it out across the United States, you would probably find the same thing. And there are areas that have done their own measurement and come up with the same conclusion.

So, we get to the point, how are we going to, from the information that you provided—and your testimony was very accurate—make people understand that people that are working part-time in many, many cases are not working part-time because they only want part-time work, but because they have no alternative, no choice.

And the other, more graphic demonstration you have laid out here is the fact that these people need to be considered for benefits at least and pension rights and everything else full-time employees receive.

I do not know, and I am not too sure that the Economic Equity Act really——

Ms. PEARCE. It does address a couple of the issues. One is the pension right vestment—move it down from 1,000 hours a year to 500 hours a year. And that would make it very difficult for people to hire part-time workers just under the 1,000 hours.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Yes, a 500 hour reduction is a great help. But I don't think even that goes far enough. I guess there has got to be a break somewhere, but I am not sure that 500 hours is necessarily it.

But even at that there are still some other loopholes that we don't address.

Ms. PEARCE. I think we should mandate in a variety of ways, like the prorating of benefits, that part-time work is simply a reference to hours, not in terms of status.

Especially, the issue about voluntary, I have been reading a number of Bureau of Labor statistics publications. And every time you turn around it becomes clear that they even distinguish between the voluntary and involuntary, and simply do not count voluntary part-time employment.

The economic consequences of being a part-time employee are the same whether one "chooses" or is "forced" into that situation. So, the women who, because she cannot get child care, works part-

time should not be punished for doing a good job of taking care of her children and not know leaving them alone or whatever in terms of economic terms. She probably needs even more because she does not have the resources to compete in the very difficult child care market. She needs even more to be paid a fair wage, to get the prorated benefits, rather than punished for having made that choice and told, well, since it was voluntary, you can get along. Well, you cannot eat voluntary, you know. You need the same wages. And I think to try to do that across the board to make working part-time just a number of hours rather than in terms of everything else, wages.

And also we are taking about over people's work lives the ability to build a career or seniority in a job so that one builds towards a pension. One builds work experience that is valued by employers.

I mean, if you think about how people talk about part-time employees and how they are valued, there is no question that employers do not value part-time experience. Workers themselves do not value it. In our society we simply have ghettoized part-time workers. But it is an invisible ghetto. And I think for that reason it is very much more insidious than some of the more obvious ghettoes and we should do something about it.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Prorating is a very excellent idea, and it is very equitable. I do not how anybody could argue with prorating. If you work a certain number of hours, you are entitled to a certain number of benefits.

Ms. PEARCE. You might find less of this distinction too because one of the reasons that even the primary sector employers are converting to part-time is that the fringe benefits now are about a third of the wage cost that employers pay. If you can cut a third out of your wage bill by converting from full-time to part-time, obviously you have an economic incentive to do it. And we need to take away that economic incentive. Just like we have created economic incentives like the targeted jobs tax credit and other such things to gear the way in which employers go about hiring people and structuring work, we could do the same thing here, take away the economic incentive to hire part-time workers without benefits.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Since so many of the part-time workers are women, I think you have provided us with provocative testimony here and those things that are in this testimony we should carry forth in a more—what would I say—in a more visible way so that we can make sure that we address that particular situation. I think you have brought us some very valuable testimony.

I want to thank both of you for appearing before us today. And I think we have done a pretty good job about providing for the record enough testimony that we can provide enough debate to argue these questions as we go. Thank you very much, both of you. We are adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12:30 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

[Material submitted for inclusion in the record follows:]

THIS LETTER APPEARED IN CONGRESSIONAL RECORD JULY 20,1987 PP 2951-2

TO: Congresswoman Barbara Boxer
FROM: Annette Klang Small of Novato, Calif.
RE: Letter on H.R. 1636 to be inserted in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD--Extension of Remarks

CREATION OF A FEDERAL COUNCIL ON WOMEN

My remarks here refer to H.R.1636, your bill that would establish a Federal Council on Women (FCW) as an advisory body to the Congress. The FCW would help to address the severe social problem called the feminization of poverty and would, at the same time, help advance the general status of all women and the children they care for. Clearly, solutions to problems facing children in poverty are inseparable from women's issues.

The major fact that the FCW bill addresses is that our government has failed to develop a comprehensive and coherent domestic policy dealing with homemakers, working women and older retired women. These three female groups, in themselves, constitute a disproportionate percentage of the nation's adult poor. And when the numbers of children in poverty are added, then we see a clearly-defined focus of one of the major causes of poverty in America and how it has been--and is being--spawned cyclically to become a greater and greater burden. The burden falls not only on the deprived of both genders, but is a burden that affects the general public good and the federal budget as well.

This social problem is surely not an isolated one since it effectively penetrates the quality of life of all our citizens. Yet what has been sorely lacking at the federal level is a tool, like the proposed FCW, that could help remedy a situation that has been suffering from national policy neglect. Such a policy of neglect by the highest levels of government needs, at long last, to be substituted with a full-drawn effort. The seeds of that full-drawn effort are contained in the idea of a FCW, which in itself could help to assist in defining and constructing a policy seeking solutions.

The administration's failure to come up with such a policy has left us, as time goes on, with more and more complex and challenging social problems, only a fraction of which have ever been fully acknowledged or addressed. Most often proposed reforms have been dealt with only in bits and pieces of fragmented legislation--legislation that has no foundation in a clearly defined national policy or committment.

A good example of this lack of legislative development devoid of a national policy is reflected in the track record of the Economic Equity Act, which was first introduced in 1981. Since that time that Act, which proposes significant reforms for women in the workplace, in the home, in the family and in their older years, has, not surprisingly, made little headway. The Act's progress has been minimal basically because no federal policy in those areas has ever been laid out.

Another reason why our progress toward advancing women's economic and social status has been so slow is because of the under-representation of women in Congress. Since women constitute only 2 per cent of the Senate and a little over 5 per cent in the House, such a representational discrepancy has served both to narrow the legislative agenda and inhibit needed policy development for 51 per cent of the population.

-1-

To help remedy this gender imbalance in our representational system, the creation of a vehicle to provide women with more say and input into the political agenda is needed. Such an opportunity for female participation would be opened up by the very existence of the FCW. At the present time, because women's voices do not have such an outlet, or conduit, many now feel we are unable to effectively influence the political agenda. Actually, many feel alienated from the political system itself.

It is no wonder so many of us feel this way. For too many years there has been this vacuum in fair representation--and never more so than now under the current administration. Few people realize that President Reagan is the first president since 1961 never to have issued an executive order to create a women's advisory body with the goal of enhancing the quality of women's lives. Therefore, it is now up to Congress to fill this leadership gap by now establishing an advisory body on a permanent basis until equality of political representation has been achieved by both genders.

Simply put, the FCW is seen as a tool to help rectify women's unequal status in the political arena. We view it as giving our concerns more legislative access and attention to what we feel are legitimate rights-based issues. Further, compared to most men, women have a far greater economic and social investment in children. The fact that there are so many female single parents has not received sufficient attention in the legislative arena.

Our lack of a refined public policy--beyond traditional welfare programs--dealing with women's day-to-day responsibilities, obligations and needs in the areas of child care, parental leave, health care and pensions have gone largely unattended. At long last, these fundamental issues must be confronted honestly and head-on--or our fture will be imperiled.

As an advisory arm of the Congress and as an instrument to stimulate needed reforms for today's world, an FCW would attempt to bring the female poverty issue to its rightful high-priority rank on the national agenda. It would do this by helping to define a public policy consistent with the present reality of women's lives--not yesterday's. In this way, the FCW would also function as a think tank whose informed and highly qualified participants would be people who will be dealing with issues they are already so familiar with. It is expected that think tank people will be genuine experts because they will have had life experiences in dealing with the very issues for which they seek solutions.

Having led the drive to get the FCW bill introduced, I am very much in touch with the grass roots support for this measure and I have been heartened by the enthusiastic bipartisan response received wherever this proposal has been explained. It has been endorsed by numerous groups, including the California legislature, in addition to many grass roots constituents, both men and women who have been signing petitions nationwide. Our growing number of backers look forward to similar enthusiastic support from the U.S. Congress because the time was never sooner for action to be taken to create a FCW. Its very existence would help to acknowledge women's presence to a far greater extent than it is now in the political procep.